THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN LITURGY

BY

REV. JOSEF MARIA NIELEN

TRANSLATED BY

REV. PATRICK CUMMINS, O.S.B.

Monk of Conception Abbey

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.

AND

33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.

1941

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
Printed in U.S.A.

IMPRIMI POTEST
Ex abbatia Immac. Concept. die 14. Dec., 1940
✠ *Stephanus Schappler, O.S.B.*
Abbas Coadjutor

NIHIL OBSTAT
Sti. Ludovici, die 9. Jan., 1941
F. J. Holweck,
Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR
Sti. Ludovici, die 10. Jan., 1941
✠ *Joannes J. Glennon,*
Archiepiscopus

Copyright 1941
B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

This work is an attempt to give a comprehensive survey of the prayer and liturgy of primitive Christianity. This survey rests exclusively on those accounts of things liturgical which we find in the New Testament. No survey of this kind has been undertaken since 1854, when Theodosius Harnack published a work entitled *Der christliche Gemeindegottesdienst im apostolischen und altkatholischen Zeitalter* ("Christian Public Worship in the Age of the Apostles and Primitive Catholics"). That work did not even then meet all necessary requirements. The eighty years between have opened rich fields of learning, have given us wide information in the history and science of religion, have seen the birth of a new interest in the history of liturgy, especially with regard to the influence radiating from permanent liturgical formulas. Some of the works published during those eight decades are special investigations of single liturgical questions, but not systematic treatises on common public Christian prayer, not complete pictures of the early Christian community as organized in liturgical worship. Those treatises which are complete and systematic have in view not the New Testament period alone, but also post-apostolic times. Furthermore, these treatises, however ample in scope,

deal with Christian liturgy, not exclusively but only concomitantly, as one element among many.

This present work, on the contrary, keeps its eye on the early Christian liturgy. It studies, indeed, the private forms of Christian prayer, but only to show how these private forms lead up to, or down from, public liturgical prayer. And the period which the work studies is that bounded by the New Testament writings, which alone serve as sources.

A secondary purpose aimed at by this work is to show how the daily lives of early Christians were interwoven with their public worship of God.

For many reasons the book has been long in the making. One temptation the author must even now resist. The present age clamors for a dogmatico-speculative evaluation of texts and sources. Such a treatment seems to this age more in harmony with the early Christian overflowing abundance of divine life which was their gift. Joy and freedom in the knowledge that flows from faith attract our age more than does the slow and laborious task of sifting and solidifying. But the author, though intent on leading the joyful believer into the full richness of his faith, can still not forget the hours dedicated to the task of studying the sources historically, and of listening to the verdict which those sources alone can give. Faith profits by all knowledge. To bring to the surface the historical truths imbedded in the New Testament writings, will be for faith itself a great gain.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

This book addresses directly the historian of the liturgy. What was the earliest Christian liturgy? Did it originate in Christ's life of prayer? How much of the Jewish liturgy did Christian liturgy retain? Did it borrow from pagan liturgies? How much in its development was due to elements specifically Christian? These questions are answered in the first part of the book. The second part tells in detail how, where, and when the early Christian congregations prayed and sang; how they exercised the charismatic gifts of prophecy and tongues; how they celebrated the Lord's Supper; how their spontaneous enthusiasm was guided into the channels of order and decorum.

Limited in scope to Christian liturgy in its earliest form, the book is likewise limited in its method. As source book the author uses the New Testament, and the New Testament alone. His purpose rules out all later evidence, even that furnished by the apostolic Fathers. What does the New Testament tell us of the early Christian liturgy? This question, and this question alone, finds answer in this book.

This limited viewpoint has advantages and disadvantages. It enables the author to study the New Testament very thoroughly. It concentrates the reader's

attention on those house churches where Christianity was preached and sung before the New Testament was written. It shows how the living liturgical language, both speech and song, surrounded, like an atmosphere, the New Testament author when he took pen in hand to compose. Christian literature is the echo of Christian liturgy. This is a commonplace. But that commonplace springs here into new life.

This positive advantage is accompanied by a negative advantage. We are familiar with the tendency, from which Catholic writers are not immune, to imagine that, because our cause is good, our arguments, in particular our arguments from Scripture, are likewise good. Against this tendency the present book is a good antidote. The author's limited viewpoint enables him to penetrate more deeply into passages which have suffered from being read in the light of later connotations.

But this advantage is attended by a corresponding disadvantage. Tradition is one unbroken unity, stretching like a chain across the centuries. The links of that chain form the only road by which the scholar may go back to the beginning. Now the author of this book, in his laudable endeavor to rule out later developments of terminology, makes too little at times of the verdict which tradition, amid all terminological developments, has preserved unbroken from the beginning.

Correction of one extreme by another, intelligible though it be, is not commendable. Truth, not overcautiousness, is error's antidote. One critic (see the *Innsbrucker Zeitschrift,* 1938, pp. 282–84), dwelling on

this viewpoint, lectures our author severely. Certain passages, I must admit, do call for animadversion, and I append notes to that effect. But the attitude of condemnation I cannot share. Rather I would say with the critic who commented on the book in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* (August, 1938, pp. 198 f.): "Nothing of this kind that has so far appeared in this country equals this work in scope and thoroughness. . . . It is of interest to the theologian as well as to the cleric. Philologists, historians, sociologists, and the educated laity will find in the work more than a mere stimulus to pursue favorite studies in things biblical."

I add a few remarks on my aims as translator.

1. The main divisions of the author's thought I have preserved intact. But his extremely long paragraphs I have divided and occasionally recast. Long and involved sentences, to which he inclines, I have simplified.

2. His footnotes were a problem. Some of them are miniature treatises. The briefer notes, very numerous, generally refer to authors inaccessible in English. Since readers who are expert will naturally turn to the original, my duty as translator went rather to the non-technical reader. Hence I adopted the following plan:

a) Notes to sources accessible in English translation are retained.

b) Retained likewise are notes to untranslated literature when omission of such notes would weaken the author's argument.

c) Lengthy notes are summarized, but the summary attempts to clarify the issue.

d) Justice demands English equivalents of the au-

thor's translation of Scripture texts. I have retained the Douay Version where it is adequate. Where it fails, I follow the Westminster. Where neither carries the author's meaning, I translate his translation.

This work is a translation of Nielen's *Gebet und Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament,* published by Herder (Freiburg).

CONTENTS

PART I

HISTORICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS

		PAGE
INTRODUCTION		3
CHAPTER		
I.	JESUS' PRACTICE OF PRAYER	6
II.	JESUS' PRAYING IN COMMON WITH OTHERS	34
III.	JEWISH PIETY	45
IV.	JESUS' RELATION TO JEWISH PIETY	55
V.	JESUS' RELATION TO THE CHRISTIAN LITURGY	79
VI.	JEWISH INFLUENCES AFFECTING THE PRIMITIVE LITURGY	96
VII.	PAGAN INFLUENCES	115
VIII.	PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN LITURGY A CONSEQUENCE OF CHRISTIAN FAITH	133
IX.	LITURGY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS	142
X.	LITURGICAL WORSHIP OF JESUS, THE DYING AND RISEN LORD	163
XI.	IMPORTANCE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS	176

PART II

GENESIS OF THE CHRISTIAN LITURGY

XII.	PRAYER IN COMMON	195

CHAPTER PAGE

XIII. Contents of Liturgical Prayer . . . 229
XIV. Scripture Reading in Common 241
XV. Instruction in Common 251
XVI. The Gifts of Prophecy and Tongues . . 263
XVII. The Singing of Psalms and Hymns. . . 281
XVIII. The Breaking of Bread 290
XIX. The Lord's Supper 300
XX. The Table of the Lord and the Cup of the Lord. 309
XXI. Fellowship in the Lord's Body and Blood 317
XXII. Liturgical Places and Times 330
XXIII. Participation of the Faithful. . . . 349
XXIV. Regulation of Liturgical Worship . . 379
XXV. Fundamental Forms of the Liturgy . . 391
XXVI. Language of the Liturgy 397

Appendix. The Words of Institution. Greek Texts 404

Index 405

PART I

HISTORICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS

INTRODUCTION

JESUS AS THE SOURCE OF THE PRIMITIVE LITURGY

A CORRECT knowledge of the public prayer and liturgy of the first Christians is impossible without previous knowledge of the ideas of Jesus about prayer and liturgy. By reason of the influence which His doctrine and example exercised, the manner of His prayer and service of God became the goal and the foundation of the Christian life of prayer and worship.

As is made evident by psychological and ethnological investigations, prayer is among all nations, with whatever variations in the liturgical relations of man to God, a natural expression of religious feeling. Consequently a community of religious men without common prayer is inconceivable. We find this same truth exemplified in the life and influence of Jesus. We find it expressed the more strongly and persistently from His belonging to a people religiously mature, which had long since possessed lofty forms of prayer and elaborate liturgical practices. Furthermore, the written records about Him show that Jesus, independently of all external influence, lived a life of prayer. "Thou shalt serve the Lord alone," [1] was the guidepost of His life,

[1] Matt. 4: 10; Luke 4: 8.

a life in and for God. These records also show that the common prayer and worship of those who believed in Him reflect His own religious traits. The prayer and worship of the first Christians carry on their face unmistakable traits of their Master, and vice versa the prayer of the primitive Christian community can be recognized in the prayer of Jesus, which it strove to reproduce. To deny this statement would be to deny the specific traits of Christian prayer, or then to deny the origin of these traits in the imitation of Christ. That Jesus was for His disciples the teacher of prayer in every sense of the word, belongs to the best established points of New Testament tradition and literature.

Here our investigation must begin if we would show clearly the features that mark the prayer and liturgy of the first Christian communities. Our first step, then, must be to see what Jesus' word and example taught about public prayer and worship. And we must lay our chief stress on His own deeds and words as the expression of His life of prayer and of His concept of liturgy.

All our findings will be restricted by the limits of scientific investigation in such sublime matters. Into the inner sanctuary of the life of prayer, whether in the case of an ordinary man or more especially in the case of Jesus, scientific investigation alone cannot penetrate. It can only seek out the occasional traces of the prayers of Jesus, it can only note where, when, and how He engaged in prayer. But to lay bare the inward language of the heart of Him, who in a most special sense called

God His Father, who made it His life's work to remain in continual union with that Father—this task is beyond scientific penetration. Still we can say that, when we look back over His life, certain facts emerge from the written testimonies about Him and enable us to reach conclusions about His interior life, characterized by originality and self-assurance in His relations to God. These relations became for His Church precept and example.

CHAPTER I

JESUS' PRACTICE OF PRAYER

THE traces of Jesus' life of prayer are infrequent and merely occasional in the New Testament writings. Still they give a clear picture of His life of prayer. To grasp this full picture as a background for the early Christians' life of prayer, we must consider each of these instances that we may discover the traits which taken together will depict the prayer of Jesus.

One trait is to be found in a special and clear manner in the accounts of the first three Evangelists. The trait is this: Jesus frequently withdraws into solitude when He wishes to pray. The quiet of evening, the early morning, the still night, wilderness, mountain, and garden, are mentioned as places that saw Him praying alone. "And in the morning, long before daybreak, He arose and went forth to a desert place, and gave Himself to prayer." [1] "And straightway He compelled the disciples to embark in the boat and to go before Him to the other side, while He dismissed the crowds. . . . Now He went into a mountain alone to pray. And when it was

[1] Mark 1: 35.

evening, He was there alone." [2] "But He retired to the wilderness and gave Himself to prayer." [3] "Now it came to pass in these days that He went forth to a mountain to pray; and He spent the night in prayer to God." [4] "About eight days after these words He took Peter and James and John, and went up to a mountain to pray." [5] "And He went forth and made His way, as was His custom, to the Mount of Olives, and His disciples likewise followed Him. And when He came to the place He said to them: 'Pray that ye enter not into temptation.' " [6]

Our prayer is not required that God may remember us or learn our need in order to help us.[7] The reason why God wants us to pray, is that man needs prayer for his own sake. Consequently man should use those aids which enable him to pray more easily. Jesus found such an aid in solitude. However, we must not suppose that the occasions referred to by these texts are the only times when Jesus prayed. His entire life was penetrated by prayer. Prayer accompanied the most important events and decisions of His life from His baptism by John [8] to His agony in Gethsemane, to His death on the cross. From this viewpoint the prayers which He offered in solitude are only occasional expressions of His perpetual life of prayer.

That Jesus insisted rather on the inward disposition than on outward bearing is the meaning of the words

[2] Matt. 14: 23; cf. Mark 6: 46.
[3] Luke 5: 16.
[4] Luke 6: 12.
[5] Luke 9: 28.
[6] Luke 22: 39 f.
[7] Matt. 6: 8.
[8] Luke 3: 21.

handed down to us in Matt. 6:1–6, the text admonishing us to pray in our chamber behind closed doors. This text is placed by the Evangelist among the sharp antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount. This fact alone, to say nothing of the entire context in which the passage stands, shows that the words are a condemnation of the wrong disposition at prayer, as manifested in the theatrical attitudes at that time so common in the Jewish Oriental world. At the same time the words are a commendation of genuine honest prayer, of the piety that flows from the heart and takes hold of the entire man, reaching the innermost depths of his being. We should not pray like the hypocrites who stand in the assembly and on the street corners to display their piety to men,[9] but we should make our prayer a conversation of our heart with the Father. Only when public and common prayer is born of a pharisaical spirit, outwardly one thing and inwardly another,[10] only then is it condemned by these words of Jesus, who ever judges outward deeds according to their inward spirit.

Some of the prayers which Jesus spoke publicly are contained more or less verbatim in the New Testament writings. We will consider these prayers in the order in which they appear in the Gospels. And from them we may see most clearly what is Jesus' attitude toward public prayer.

a) His prayer of praise and thanksgiving.[11]

[9] Just before these words is the exhortation, "Sound not a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do . . . that they may be honored by men" (Matt. 6: 2).

[10] Cf. Matt. 23: 27.

[11] Matt. 11: 25 ff.; Luke 10: 21 f.

I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth,
because Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and
prudent,
and hast revealed them unto babes:
yea, Father, because it hath been well-pleasing in Thine
eyes.
All things have been delivered to Me by My Father;
and no one knoweth the Son except the Father,
nor doth anyone know the Father except the Son,
and he to whom the Son may choose to reveal Him.

That we are dealing here with a public prayer of Jesus and not with an effusion of the heart in the form of a monologue in quiet seclusion, is shown by the way the prayer is introduced in Luke 10: 17 and the way it ends, Luke 10: 24. It is introduced by the return of the seventy-two disciples, who are present during the prayer, the end of which is closely connected with the invocation at the beginning. We reach the same conclusion when we consider the nature of this prayer, which is in no way that of reflection and meditation, but rather that of a unique, original, and spontaneous cry from the heart of Christ.[12]

[12] The subjective reasons which are urged against the genuineness of the second half of this cry of jubilation (cf. J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des N. T.*, 1917, I, 310) have no force against the sound testimony of textual criticism. The passage has exactly the same wording in Matthew and Luke. If a critic is inclined to insist upon the different character of the first half as contrasted with the second half, there a confession of a very personal sort, here a doctrinal presentation, there the first person and here the third person, we reply that such a transition from first to third person is found in other hymnlike prayers; thus particularly in the psalms (cf. Ps. 21: 26–32; 30: 15–20; 50: 16, 19; 65; 68: 30, 37; 129). The unity of the passage is shown also by the following reasons. (1) Verse 27 stands to verses 25 and 26 in the relation of cause to effect. (2) The prayer is the expression of a deep inward emotion which cannot therefore be measured by merely logical rules. (3) The assumption that this passage, on account of its sublime contents, was tampered with at a very early date, falls to the

Luke especially, who best depicts Jesus' inward life of prayer, has thus described the mood of this exulting cry: "That very hour He exulted in the Holy Spirit"; [13] while Matthew uses one of his usual forms of transition. Jesus' prayer is the continuation and consummation of that spiritual elevation reached for the first time in the inspired prophets and psalmists of the Old Testament. It is a joyful confession that God is the supreme Lord of heaven and earth, to whose power all things are subject. The disciples' childlike joy at their success is manifested in words that have deep meaning in that period which was so full of fear of the demons.[14] "Lord, even the devils are subject to us in Thy name." [15] In the case of Jesus this same joy is mingled

---

ground in view of the fact that all Greek MSS and early versions present the text as we have it today. (4) The doctrine contained in this passage does not go beyond the tradition which we otherwise find in the Gospels. (Cf. Luke 1: 46–55, 68–79.)

On the contrary, the very fact that this passage has a breadth and depth otherwise seldom found in the Synoptics, removes the suspicion that it is an invention. Were this pronouncement not the genuine words of Jesus, the author of the First Gospel would never have invented them. The difficulties just mentioned as well as others are given briefly in Klostermann, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium,* 1927, pp. 102 f. Edward Norden, in his *Agnostos theos,* 1913, has devoted to this logion a special investigation (pp. 277–308). According to him, the logion has a form very often found in the most ancient writings by Christian converts from Judaism. Like all these logia, our present passage contains these three elements: thanksgiving, reception of wisdom (gnosis), the addressing of words to men. Orphel, in his *Das Paulusgebet,* 1933, p. 3, speaks as follows: "The silver of direct address to God must be regained by being separated from the epistolary style with which it is alloyed." This truth is likewise of importance for the understanding of Jesus' words of prayer in the Gospel. The importance of this passage as an evidence of Jesus' consciousness of His divinity is referred to by Tillmann, *Das Selbstbewusstsein des Gottessohnes,* 3d ed., 1921, pp. 79–81, and by H. Schumacher, *Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu bei Mt. 11: 27 (Lk. 10: 22),* 1912.

[13] Luke 10: 21.

[14] Acts 17: 22: Δεισιδαίμονες, which D.V. renders by "superstitious."

[15] Luke 10: 17.

with a glad consciousness that His Messianic activity, accompanied and protected by the will of God, is the beginning of a victorious propagation of God's empire over all hostile powers through its victory in the hearts of men. The victory of God over the world, of His kingdom over the kingdom of darkness, is the joyful undertone that ever and again breaks forth out of the prayers of Christ just as it does out of the prayers of the first Christians. Here in this cry of exultation we hear it for the first time as it pours forth from Jesus' firm confidence in the almighty will of God. What is the will of God, the Lord of heaven and earth, but the founding of His kingdom, the kingdom of the Messias in place of the kingdom of the world and of evil?

Here, too, in this first public prayer of Jesus, we meet not only the thought of the kingdom of God, the heartfelt petition for the coming of God's kingdom, but also that other guiding motive of His life and prayer: "Father, Thy will." God's will, which is to be accomplished by Him, the Messias, and by His disciples, the little ones, inexperienced in human wisdom, will also be fulfilled in the souls of men and thereby become the foundation of His kingdom. This success, with such a manifest and promising beginning, fills His soul with deepest gratitude. Hence the words, "I confess to Thee," [16] which stand at the beginning of the prayer both in Matthew and in Luke, instead of the simple "I thank Thee," are an expression of joyful gratitude pouring forth from a full heart. But this gratitude is that of a child to its father. For this prayer,

[16] Matt. 11: 25; Luke 10: 21.

too, like all prayers of Jesus, begins with the word "Father." And this fact alone, that the prayer of Jesus is not limited to God as Lord but addresses Him always as Father, shows forth the inmost soul of Him who so prayed. And from this viewpoint the first prayer of Jesus has a fundamental importance for the understanding of the idea of prayer that prevailed in the liturgical life of the first Christians.

Briefly, this cry of exultation is characterized by the refrain: the kingdom of God, the will of God, God the Father. As a standard for judging ancient Christian public prayer, this result is of the greatest importance.

b) His prayer in Gethsemane.

My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me; yet not as I will, but as Thou wilt.[17]

My Father, if this cannot pass unless I drink it, Thy will be done.[18]

Abba, Father, all things are possible to Thee; remove this cup from me; yet not as I will, but as Thou wilt.[19]

Father, if Thou wilt, remove this cup from Me; yet not My will, but Thine be done.[20]

We must first meet an objection. How can these prayers of Jesus, which were spoken when He was alone, in His agony, be considered public prayers? The Gospel tells us that the wish to be alone drew Him away even from His most intimate disciples. How could these drowsy witnesses hear His words exactly?

[17] Matt. 26: 39.
[18] Matt. 26: 42 (44).
[19] Mark 14: 36.
[20] Luke 22: 42.

But even if we consider the Gospels merely as historical works, the contents of the Synoptics' account of that hour of prayer, impressed on the remembrance of the disciples, give us the very kernel of the long earnest prayer of Jesus in those painful hours. Hence we can further say [21] that this prayer on the Mount of Olives comes from that same inward attitude of soul which we found to be the characteristic of His first public prayer: "My Father, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." If this view is admitted, then we can say further that in all moods and in all situations, whether sad or happy, the beginning and ending of Jesus' prayers exhibit the relation of child to father, and consequently a trustful resignation to the will of that father. This conclusion is not affected by the genuinely human quality of this petition, which asks that the chalice of the passion may be removed. This petition, resting on the condition that it be the Father's will, shows what intimate depth of feeling lies in the use of the word "Father" with which the petition begins.[22]

And this petition was granted. Not indeed by the literal fulfilment of the request, but by an answer which pro-

[21] The truth of the account of our Lord's suffering and prayer on the Mount of Olives is confirmed by the important testimony of the Epistle to the Hebrews (5: 7 f.). This epistle, although its subject is mostly Christological, exalting the divinity of the Son, "who is the brightness of His glory and the figure of His substance" (1: 3), insists on the reality and genuineness of His humanity, of Him "who became so much better than the angels, as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they" (1: 4). Some early writers, with an exaggerated desire to exalt the divinity of Christ, omitted verses 7 and 8 of chapter 5, which speak of Christ as praying "with a strong cry and tears." For this reason the passage is lacking in some manuscripts. Cf. Harnack, *Probleme im Texte der Leidensgeschichte Jesu*, 1901, I, 254 (on Luke 22: 53 f.).

[22] Mark 14: 36.

foundly accorded with the Son's confidence in the Father. The human wish to be delivered from death was spoken conditionally; the other, "Thy will be done," unconditionally. That the prayer was heard is evident from its fruits: strength and tranquillity of soul, which were restored to Him and which He retained through all the long hours of suffering, even to His last breath on the cross. By this prayer He obtained persevering joyfulness in suffering.[23]

In this petition of Jesus we note His awareness of being the Messias, announcing God's kingdom, even though He must go to death that that kingdom may come.[24] The three elements of the refrain (Father, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done), which we noted in the first public prayer of Jesus, are repeated in the prayer in the garden.

The urgency and intimacy of this prayer are emphasized by reference to His bodily posture: He fell upon His face; He fell upon the ground; He knelt in prayer.[25] They are likewise emphasized by His admonition to the disciples to pray.[26] These texts strengthen the impression of historical reality. For here we find no sign of the apologetic tendency to sacrifice the evidences of fear and anguish to a false notion of Jesus' greatness. Furthermore, this instance shows that Jesus remains genuinely human in the expression of His feelings. Falling to the ground, He repeats the same words. His fear and trepidation are in contrast to the presumption

[23] Von der Goltz, *Das Gebet,* p. 20. In confirmation I refer to Matt. 26: 46 and John 18: 11.

[24] Matt. 7: 21; Luke 23: 42; John 18: 36; Heb. 10: 8 f.

[25] Matt. 26: 39; Mark 14: 35; Luke 22: 41.

[26] Matt. 26: 41; Mark 14: 38; Luke 22: 46.

of strength by the disciples. Further, as contrasted with their real weakness, His heroic resignation shines all the brighter. Jesus is not asking His disciples to strengthen His prayer by theirs, but is rather manifesting sympathy for those who are subject to weakness of the flesh notwithstanding the willingness of the spirit. He Himself, on the contrary, with full knowledge of the divine will, overcomes the weakness of the flesh by prayer.[27]

c) His prayer on the cross.

"Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit." "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." [28]

This obedient resignation by Christ to the will of His heavenly Father, with which His whole life is filled, is expressed also in the last public prayer quoted in the Synoptic Gospels: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit." [29] This prayer is the simple natural expression of that confident and filial attitude toward the Father, which Jesus manifested also on other occasions. While darkness is falling around Him, there flames in the heart of Him who learned obedience by suffering,[30] a fulness of filial affection which accompanied all His activity and, at the beginning of His passion, gave the greatest proof of sincerity. Had this prayer been the invention of a later writer, we would not have therein the simple human act of resignation

[27] Matt. 26: 33–35 (and parallels).
[28] Luke 23: 46; Matt. 27: 46 (Mark 15: 34) and Luke 23: 34.
[29] Luke 23: 46.
[30] Heb. 5: 8.

to God's will, but rather the joyful confidence of His coming resurrection and ascension. But the actual words are a consolation for all men who die in Christ. These very words were on the lips of the protomartyr Stephen as he was dying.[31] And following him, all those who unite their sufferings to those of Christ commend their souls into the hands of the Father.[32] Thus again Jesus is the first-born among many brethren.

This confident invocation "Father" is found again in another prayer on the cross: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." [33] Both form and contents of this prayer [34] are in harmony with the doctrine which Jesus taught,[35] with His method of acting,[36] with the manner of praying which He taught His disciples.[37] Thus these words are a new proof for the intimacy and filial nature of His relation to the Father. There is further in these words the expression of hope that the Father will guide the joys and sorrows of men, that He can punish and reward, that He can penalize and forgive, and that forgiveness is a pre-eminent divine characteristic because the Father knows human ignorance. This word of Jesus is the source of the early Christian prayer: "And whensoever ye stand at prayer, forgive if ye have aught against any man, that your Father who

31 Acts 7: 59.

32 I Pet. 4: 13 ff.

33 Luke 23: 34.

34 Its genuineness finds also elsewhere early attestation. Cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 21, note 1; Resch, *Ausserkanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien*, III, 721–23.

35 Matt. 5: 44; 18: 21–35; Luke 6: 27 ff.

36 Luke 22: 48, 51.

37 Matt. 6: 9, 12; Luke 11: 4; cf. Rom. 12: 14; I Cor. 4: 12.

is in heaven may likewise forgive you your transgressions." [38] That the liturgical prayer of the early Church had its source in the prayer of Christ is a subject that we will treat at length later on.

We must now note two shorter prayers of the dying Lord, which seem to contradict the position we have so far maintained. How could one who trusted in the Father say: "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" [39] We may reply that these words cannot be understood as expressing lack of resignation by one who in Gethsemane accepted the chalice of His approaching passion, saying: "Father, Thy will, not Mine." [40] We explain the unusual formulation of His prayer on the cross from the fact that He was using the words of the twenty-first psalm. The cry, seemingly an expression of despair, is in reality a prayer befitting the circumstances. This psalm begins with the words which Jesus uttered, and ends with a profession of the strongest confidence in God. Further we find a personal note in Jesus' use of the word "My." Here the words, "My God, My God," mean on the lips of Jesus what He so frequently expressed by the words "My Father."

Jesus was using a traditional formula which, however, on His lips had a special tone and significance. This significance is found not only in the invocation, but also in the whole petition. By this invocation the whole petition gets its special import on the lips of the

[38] Mark 11: 25.
[39] Matt. 27: 46; Mark 15: 34.
[40] Matt. 26: 39.

dying Son of God. It is wrong to explain this petition as merely an apparent prayer.[41] The words of Jesus were always a genuine expression of His thoughts, also on the cross. In this instance the abandonment cannot be that of a sinner rejected by God. The words were not so understood by the Evangelist,[42] not so intended by the psalmist.[43] The genuineness of the text is beyond dispute, even though its interpretation presents difficulties. From our knowledge of Jesus' personality and of His prayer, we are justified in asserting that this prayer is not an expression of failure, or of protest against the will of His Father, but rather an expression of the anguish of His heart unburdening itself amid unspeakable suffering. Thus viewed, this prayer of Jesus becomes a profession of filial loyalty to God, whom He acknowledges as His Father even in the deepest suffering, and whom He is ready to obey to the very end.[44]

This is not the only time that Jesus clothes His own feelings and wishes with a psalm verse. The prayer we have already discussed [45] is also taken from a psalm. This psalm verse can be considered the dying prayer of all

[41] Von der Goltz, *Das Gebet*, p. 24, rejects this view.

[42] Cf. Mt. 27: 50 ff. This passage describes the events that occurred at Jesus' death: the rending of the veil of the Temple, the earthquake, the opening of the rocks, and the coming forth of the dead.

[43] See especially verses 23–25.

[44] "We find a unique parallel to Mt. 27: 46 and Mark 15: 34 in II Tim. 4: 16 ff. Jesus on the cross prayed the words given in Ps. 21: 2. . . . Now, St. Paul says that in his first trial all had forsaken him. In verse 17, St. Paul uses the very words of psalm 21, when he says: 'The Lord stood by me and strengthened me . . . and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.' Hence St. Paul applied this psalm to his own imitation of the Lord." Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, 1902, p. 296.

[45] Luke 23: 46.

pious Israelites. In the original Hebrew [46] it runs thus: "Into Thy hand I commend my breath, Thou redeemest me, Jahve, Thou faithful God." In the Septuagint it runs as follows: "Into Thy hands I commend My spirit." [47] A general conclusion is warranted: Jesus adopted in His public prayers words that others had coined before Him; at least He so adopted words from the Book of Psalms.

On many occasions we find passages where Jesus applied psalmistic prophecies to Himself or where He spoke in the language of the psalms. We have an explicit mention of His reciting or singing a psalm in Mark 14: 26: "After a hymn they went forth." This passage can hardly be understood in any other sense than that Jesus according to Jewish custom sang with His Apostles at the end of the pasch the second part of the Hallel, namely, psalms 114–117. But even if we did not have this explicit reference [48] and the dying prayers on the cross, we would still have the greatest probability for the view that Jesus often used verses of the psalms in His prayers. Many of the psalms and other prayers of the Old Testament are characterized by deep religious emotion and consecration and thus offered to Jesus the most suitable expression for His own inward life of prayer. Their form must have appealed to Him by reason of their poetic and childlike manner of speaking to God. Jesus' speeches also give testimony of His deep familiarity with the most precious prayers inherited by His people, prayers sancti-

[46] Ps. 31: 6.
[47] Ps. 30: 6.
[48] Mark 14: 26.

fied by public and private worship in the Temple, in the synagogue, and in the home. Now if we consider the close relationship between Jesus' thoughts and His speech, between His life and His prayer, and admit that He employed psalmistic words in conversation with His disciples [49] and in discussion with His enemies,[50] we should likewise suppose that He made use of them in converse with His heavenly Father. After what we have already said, we are warranted in considering the following passages as psalmistic prayers of Jesus to His Father: first, Mark 14: 26, which will be treated more extensively later on; secondly, Matt. 27: 46 (cf. Mark 15: 34), which is taken from the twenty-first psalm; thirdly, His prayer in death, Luke 23: 46, which is evidently taken from psalm 30, but in a form characteristic of Jesus.[51]

Our general conclusion, then, is that, in the prayers which we can recognize as having been taken explicitly from others, there is still evident some slight variation proper to Himself, wherein we recognize with sufficient clearness that the form which He borrowed was never for Him a mere formula, but rather the suitable expression of His own attitude in prayer. Examples of this we have given in the invocations "Father" and "My God."

As a summary of this study of the Synoptic Gospels, we repeat the three elements of the refrain: Father, Thy kingdom, Thy will.

[49] John 2: 17; 13: 18; 16: 25.
[50] Matt. 22: 41 ff.; Mark 12: 35; Luke 20: 41 ff.; John 6: 31; 10: 35.
[51] Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit.

EVIDENCE OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL

The prayers of Jesus recorded by St. John must be treated separately because many critics consider them a departure from the older Synoptic tradition. The viewpoint of these critics may be expressed in the words of one of them, "The Johannine Christ can simply not pray at all." [52]

The starting-point of this criticism lies in the peculiarities of the Johannine tradition. We must admit that St. John's Gospel has an individually marked character sharply distinguished from that of the Synoptic Gospels both in the selection and arrangement of the facts recorded and in their literary form. Jesus' speeches in particular are stamped with the individual style of the Evangelist. They have such a close relation with the speeches of the Baptist and with the direct words of the Evangelist himself that in truth we seem to hear only the Evangelist all the way through the Gospel. Even careful and conservative scholars recognize this feature. Thus we have, for instance, Tillmann adopting as his own the following judgment of Dausch:

> John did not receive the speeches of Jesus as a hard solid stone into his soul, but rather received them as matter to be transformed in his own congenial and sympathetic spirit. Hence particularly in translating from the Aramaic into the Greek he has stamped them with his own individual style. And why should not a familiar disciple of Jesus allow himself to repeat the Master's speeches with a certain liberty? He knew that what was best in his own mind and

[52] Walter Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium,* 1925, p. 149.

heart had blossomed like a harvest out of the seed that Jesus had planted.[53]

These reflections we should bear in mind when we use Jesus' quoted words in our consideration of His inner life of prayer and His position regarding the public prayers of the community.

The standards we are to be guided by in this investigation are, first of all, the critically established authenticity of the text; secondly, close relationship with the Synoptic tradition; [54] and thirdly, the interrelation in each particular set of circumstances between the prayers of Jesus and the outward situation. Underlying all these standards, there is the generally accepted principle that a prayer, recorded by the Fourth Evangelist as a public prayer of Jesus, must be accepted as such also in its details unless there are compelling grounds to the contrary. Our question is not whether the form of the prayers is, like that of the speeches in this Gospel, exclusively the work of the Evangelist. Rather our task is to see whether contents and form are clearly recognizable as born from the spirit of Jesus. Now the speeches and expressions which the Synoptics assign to our Lord are not verbally accurate reports of what fell from His lips. As examples we may mention first the Sermon on the Mount; [55] secondly, the prayer in Gethsemane; [56]

[53] *Das Johannesevangelium,* 1931, p. 39.

[54] On the relation between St. John and the Synoptics, cf. Jaquier, *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament,* 1908, IV, 204–61; Tillmann, *Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu,* in the series by Esser-Mausbach, *Religion, Christentum, und Kirche,* 3d ed., II, 1–119. On the reliability of St. John as a historical source, see Lepin, *La valeur historique du quatrième Evangile,* 2 vols., 1910.

[55] Matt., chaps. 5–7; Luke 6: 20–49.

[56] Matt. 26: 39; Mark 14: 36.

and thirdly, the words at the Last Supper.[57] In the case of the Synoptics we admit that what Jesus spoke in Aramaic was later expressed by them in terms suited to their individual purpose. And from this viewpoint we may well feel inclined to ascribe to St. John's Gospel a closer reproduction than we find in the other Evangelists. He was nearer to the heart of the Master. This nearness gives his Gospel its individuality in the portrayal of Jesus' deeds, teaching, and prayers.[58]

a) The prayer for glorification.

"Father, glorify Thy name." [59]

It seems best to begin our investigation with this text. Let us first note the context. The time is the beginning of Passion Week. Philip and Andrew come to our Lord who is teaching in the portico of the Temple, and present to Him the petition of the Greeks to see Him. Jesus answers that the hour of His glorification is near, glorification which He like all who serve Him must merit by trial, suffering, and death. " 'Now My soul is troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour. Nay, for this came I unto this hour. Father, glorify Thy name.' There came therefore a voice out of heaven,[60] 'I

[57] Matt. 26: 26 ff.; Mark 14: 22 ff.; Luke 22: 19 f.; Cf. I Cor. 11: 23 ff.

[58] "The true artist is characterized by his power of seeing his object profoundly and intuitively. St. John proves himself a great artist in the dramatic form which he gives to his Gospel. That Gospel begins in heaven and ends with the apparitions of the risen Lord. The Gospel of St. John is therefore also in its form the acme of Gospel literature." Jordan, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur,* 1911, p. 121.

[59] John 12: 28.

[60] On the rabbinic and the primitive Christian conception of the "voice from heaven," cf. Fiebig, *Bath-Kol,* in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* I, 941, and Schlatter, *Die Sprache und Heimat des Vierten Evangelisten,* 1902, p. 121.

have already glorified it, and I will glorify it again.' " [61] In this text we have a prayer in the form of reflection, in the form of a prayerful monologue, which is spoken in the presence of others, since not only the disciples but also the people (verse 29) are witnesses, and which concludes with the words, "Father, glorify Thy name."

To explain such a prayer held in the form of monologue, we must remember that it is conceivable only in hours of highest emotion, in hours of great exaltation, or in moments of painful expectation and decision. That we are dealing with such a situation is made clear by a glance at the circumstances which John describes. The petition of these pious pagans brings before the soul of Jesus that hour which the Father has destined for His glorification, but which includes likewise the duty of drinking the chalice to the dregs. This chalice stands clearly before Him. The thoughts that must have occupied Him often during the last days of His life, thoughts of the blindness of His people, of the hate borne Him by that people's false leaders, the destruction of His own life, let Him feel here already the terrible anguish of the bitter hours on Olivet. What more natural than His usual petition to the Father that the chalice may pass, that this glorification need not be bought at the price of such sacrifice? But immediately the unquestioning will to do God's work triumphs over the wish to be saved from this hour, since this hour must come in order that God's will for His glorification be fulfilled. And thus without reserve He puts passion and death, the price of His glorification, into God's hands: Father,

[61] John 12: 27 f.

glorify in that manner which Thou thinkest good. It is the same petition that we found in the Synoptics: Father, Thy will, not Mine. What He prays for is the glorification of the Father, not His own. Further, the circumstances under which John gives us this petition have nothing improbable, but rather seem entirely suited to it. Again, this prayer finds its interpretation in the high-priestly prayer.[62] The picture of Jesus which John here paints, is the same picture we find in the Synoptics, in the Epistles of St. Paul, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews: by obedience and suffering to glorification. Hence we have here a proof that the Johannine Christ prays in the same manner as the Synoptic Christ: "Father, Thy will."

b) The prayer at the grave of Lazarus (John 11: 41 f.).

Father, I give Thee thanks that Thou hast heard Me.
And I knew that Thou dost always hear Me,
But because of the multitude which standeth around, have I said it,
That they may believe that Thou hast sent Me.

What place this prayer occupies in the story of Lazarus is well known. Here also the soul of Jesus is moved and troubled (verses 34 f.). Hence we can scarcely make a mistake if here also we admit that, not only His friendship for Lazarus and his sisters,[63] but also the feeling of dread at the thought of His own death, the anticipation of Olivet, brought about this trouble of soul.

[62] John 17: 1 ff.; 19: 22 ff.

[63] Cf. Nielen, "Maria von Bethanien," in *Akademische Bonifatius-Korrespondenz*, 1929, pp. 215–21.

But now a special difficulty arises. How shall we explain that a prayer pronounced in an hour of such deep emotion, of such intimate relation to God, can pass over into a reflection on the effect this prayer will have on others? The difficulty consists, not merely in the fact that the prayer is meant likewise for the ear and heart of the audience,[64] not merely in the truth that Jesus who is sure of being heard speaks as a model for all men,[65] or that "Jesus has here a special external purpose." [66] The difficulty consists rather in this, that the prayer seems spoken only for others, that this special purpose seems to be aimed at explicitly. This is an enigma; it is more than an enigma. We cannot imagine Jesus speaking a prayer that in the last analysis is not a prayer at all, but only a monologue clothed in the form of a prayer for the sake of men. We are not allowed to solve this enigma by asserting that the Johannine Christ is unable to pray at all since He is one with the Father and consequently prayer is for Him only an appropriation of human forms for the sake of teaching men. Rather from the entire Johannine presentation as it appears in the Gospel we are justified in making the opposite conclusion. Because Jesus is one with God, He prays; and because He prays, He is one with God. This view receives light from the prayer of Jesus at the grave of His friend. The best solution of the difficulty, resting on genuine interpretation of John's world of thought, is given in the following words of Luetgert.

[64] Cf. Matt. 11: 25.

[65] Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joan.* (Migne, *PG*, LXXIV, 60).

[66] P. Schanz, *Kommentar ueber das Evangelium des hl. Johannes*, 1885, p. 19.

Jesus is certain of being heard. He already knows that He will be heard, that He has been heard, that God hears Him always. And thus is expressed the truth that all activity of Jesus, since it comes to Him from God, begins and ends in prayer. As Jesus always hears the Father, so the Father always hears Him. In this uninterrupted prayer of Jesus consists His communion with God, on it rests His power. That He can do nothing without the Father means consequently that He can do nothing without prayer. But this prayer shows no anxiety or uncertainty of being heard. Jesus' certainty does not make the prayer superfluous, but prompts and sustains it. Jesus prays without ceasing. This uninterrupted prayer remains ordinarily, just as Jesus in the Synoptics demands, in secret. But here at the grave of Lazarus it is explicitly set forth. The prayer becomes an attestation, made in order that the people shall know that God works the wonders of Jesus. What Jesus says, therefore, is, not that He is praying for the sake of the people, but that they may know His miracles to be answers to prayer.[67]

Truly these words seen in this light, in the light of conscious union with the Father, which makes the hearing a certainty, lose a great deal of what at first glance appeared to be strange and unreal on His lips. It is now clear that we are not dealing with a pretended prayer when Jesus expresses the consciousness of His oneness with God. Rather we find that our Lord, in filial fashion such as is proper to moments of strongest emotion, includes within His prayer this purpose, namely, that His hearers may not misunderstand.

This unquestioning confidence, this feeling of unconditional certainty of being heard, this genuine Synoptic coloring, and the mode of invocation so characteristic

[67] *Die Johanneische Christologie,* 1916, p. 91.

of our Lord, all these guarantee our view that this prayer is a genuine prayer of Jesus. There is nothing in it which Jesus might not say to the Father even in His solitary prayer. And if so, why should He not say it also in public? In this prayer we find nothing which the Synoptic Jesus might not have said in prayer. Why then should it be rejected as not genuine in the Johannine Christ?

Furthermore, Jesus' gesture during the prayer (verse 41) is a sign of genuine tradition. In Mark 7: 34 we find the same gesture: Jesus raises His eyes to heaven, groans, and opens the ears of the deaf mute. Again John himself (17: 1) describes our Lord in the act of raising His eyes to heaven before prayer. Raising the eyes to heaven is the recognition of heaven as God's dwelling place. It was a common practice of devout Jews. From above, Jahve bends down His ear,[68] bends down His ear to him who prays from the depths,[69] who lifts his eyes up to Him who dwells on high; [70] who dwells in heaven.[71] Most certainly, then, the gesture [72] of lifting His eyes to heaven leads the reader to expect a silent prayer. In Luke 18: 13, on the contrary, the words describing the publican at prayer, the noticing that he did not lift his eyes to heaven, is an exception that emphasizes the rule. For Jesus, then, we have the general conclusion that His act was a usual and definitely intended gesture. This conclusion will be found very useful when we

68 Ps. 85: 1.
69 Ps. 129: 1.
70 Ps. 112: 5.
71 Ps. 122: 1.
72 Mark 7: 34.

come to investigate the primitive Christian form of prayer.

c) The high-priestly prayer.[73]

Father, the hour is come: glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee, as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He may give eternal life to all whom Thou hast given Him. Now this is eternal life, that they know Thee, the only true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ. I have glorified Thee upon earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do; and now do Thou glorify Me, Father, with Thyself, with the glory which I had before the world was, with Thee.

I have manifested Thy name to the men whom Thou hast given Me out of the world. Thine they were, and to Me thou gavest them, and they have kept Thy word. Now they have known that all things whatsoever Thou hast given Me are from Thee; because the words which Thou hast given Me I have given to them and they have received them, and they have truly known that I came forth from Thee, and have believed that Thou didst send Me. For them I pray; not for the world do I pray, but for them whom Thou hast given Me, because they are Thine, and all things Mine are Thine, and all things Thine are Mine, and I am glorified in them. And I am no more in the world; and they are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep them in Thy name which Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as we also are. While I was with them I kept them in Thy name which Thou gavest Me; I have kept them, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition, that the Scripture may be fulfilled. But now I come to Thee, and these things I speak in the world, in order that they may have My joy fulfilled in themselves. I have given them Thy word, and the world hath hated

[73] John 17: 1 ff.

them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that Thou take them out of the world, but that Thou keep them from evil. They are not of the world, as I am not of the world. Sanctify them in the truth; Thy word is truth. As Thou hast sent Me into the world, so I also have sent them into the world. And for them I sanctify Myself, that they too may be sanctified in truth.

Not for them only do I pray, but also for those who believe in Me through their word, that they all may be one, even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou hast given Me, I have given them, that they may be one, as we are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one, that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and that Thou hast loved them, even as Thou hast loved Me.

Father, that which Thou hast given Me, I will that where I am, they also may be with Me; that they may behold My glory, which thou hast given Me, because Thou didst love Me before the foundation of the world. Just Father, the world hath not known Thee, but I have known Thee, and these have known that Thou hast sent Me; and I have made known Thy name to them, and will make it known, that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them.

This passage, by the gesture of the eyes raised heavenward, recalls a similar detail in the account of the raising of Lazarus (11: 41); the reference to the hour for glorification recalls a similar expression of Christ in reply to the request of the Greeks in the Temple (12: 27). The prayer we are now considering is commonly referred to as the high-priestly prayer. Since it is the prayer by which the divine priest consecrates Himself for the

immolation,[74] it has a very moving and solemn tone. In the first portion of the prayer Jesus prays for Himself (verses 1–5). In the second portion He prays for His disciples (6–19). In the third, for the followers of His disciples (20–26). In the first part He prays for His own glorification; in the second part He prays that the disciples may be preserved in union with the Father and consequently united among themselves; in the third part He prays that the followers of His disciples may become one single family of God.

Of the recorded prayers of Jesus, this is the longest. It is the longest that is anywhere recorded in the New Testament writings. The phraseology is strongly marked with the Johannine traits. It is a prayer notable for its lucidity, its harmony and rhythm.

Because of certain forms and phrases in the prayer, some readers are more impressed by the literary art of the human author than by the depth of its spontaneous spirituality.

Two verses may be cited as giving the deepest content of the prayer. "That they all may be one, even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in us" (verse 21). "That the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them" (verse 26). The high-priestly prayer, consequently, is a petition that the faithful may be bound together in unity of faith and communion of love. And this unity and communion has its source in the union of their souls with Christ and through Christ with God. Seen from

[74] Schanz, *op. cit.*, p. 515.

this viewpoint, the high-priestly prayer is the finest definition of the Church. Hence this prayer forms the best closing of Christ's preaching, the purpose of which was from the beginning the union of all men in faith and love.[75]

While we recognize therein thoughts that are familiar to the readers of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of St. John, we must not on that account regard this prayer as an invention of the Evangelist. Rather we may find important aspects that explain the literary style which the human writer has given to this prayer of Jesus. We mean that what we find here are the feelings and thoughts of Jesus. The beloved disciple has intimately grasped them. His words enable the reader to comprehend what the soul of Jesus was experiencing in that last hour, His unity with the Father, the hour of farewell from His own, the hour of His last prayer to His Father, His divine confidence in the future. Further, the prayer harmonizes in character with other prayers of Jesus and with the emotions found in all His farewell discourses of those last days. This harmony appears in the invocation (1, 5, 11, 21, 24, 25), which is the same as we always find in Jesus' prayers, namely, "Father." Above all, the harmony with other prayers is revealed in the petition for glorification. The consciousness of unity with the Father to which the high-priestly prayer gives testimony is the same as that expressed at the grave of Lazarus. And the resignation to God's will which shines out in nearly every verse of the prayer is likewise the essential element in all Jesus' prayers

[75] John 10: 16.

handed down to us by the Synoptics. The Synoptic accounts of Jesus' prayers lead us to expect that, at the close of His life, His prayer will be for His disciples, that they may preserve the spirit of discipleship. We cannot conceive His closing His life without such an expression of love for His disciples.[76]

Hence, though we recognize that St. John's Gospel has specific traits, we must maintain that its picture of our Lord's life of prayer is substantially such as we would expect after reading the earlier Gospels.

To summarize the accounts of all the Evangelists. 1. Jesus lives in the memory of His disciples as the one who prayed always, not only in hours of retirement, but also in public. 2. The source of His prayer, both public and private, was His filial confidence in the Father. 3. The object of His prayer is full unity with the divine will in establishing and spreading the kingdom of God. 4. Jesus at times clothed His prayers in the words of traditional texts. 5. His outward demeanor corresponded with His inward disposition. All these elements belong to the inheritance He left to His disciples, and they are all likewise necessary for an understanding of the prayer of the primitive Christian communities.

[76] Cf. Luke 22: 31 f. "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." This is the intercessory prayer of solicitous love.

CHAPTER II

JESUS' PRAYING IN COMMON WITH OTHERS

JESUS' TEACHING ABOUT COMMON PRAYER

DID Jesus pray in public? On the basis of the written documents, we have answered this question in the affirmative, but immediately a second question must be asked: Did Jesus pray in common with others? Common prayer presupposes public prayer. But the fact which we have already established, that Jesus prayed publicly, does not yet answer the question whether He prayed in common with His disciples. This question must now be answered, and with it the further question: What did Jesus teach about common prayer?

The sources at our command do not speak explicitly of Jesus' praying in common with His disciples. They do tell us of prayers which He spoke in the presence of others. They tell us also of His praying for others, and of His prescribing a form of community prayer. But they do not tell us of His joining in prayer. Jesus pronounces no "We" prayers, in which He himself is included with the others praying.

We must notice a seeming exception to this state-

ment. In Mark 14: 26 and Matt. 26: 30 we find these words: "And singing a psalm they went forth to the Mount of Olives." The context in both places shows that the Master and the disciples were celebrating the Jewish Pasch. What little the Gospels tell us indicates that Jesus and His disciples were observing the traditional ritual. Hence the hymn of praise which is mentioned must be the second part of the great Hallel, which embraces psalms 114–117 and which was the traditional conclusion of that ritual. But we must not consider this text by itself. Elsewhere we find recorded Jesus' custom of following at table the practice among the Jews,[1] for the head of the family to break and to bless bread.[2] All the details here given are contained in the Jewish ritual. Jesus' manner of performing these details had about it something personal and characteristic and remained so indelibly impressed in the memory of the disciples who ate with Him that later on they recognized Him thereby.[3]

The trait noted in all these places is the emphasis on praise and thanksgiving. The same two verbs are found in all accounts.[4] The blessing takes place in the form of thanksgiving. It is not our purpose to enter here on the theme of what importance the word "eucharist" [5] had in the early community so devoted to Jesus. Neither do we refer to the history of table prayer among Christians.[6]

1 Cf. O. Holtzmann, *Der Tosephtatraktat Berakot,* 1912.
2 Matt. 14: 19; 15: 36; Mark 6: 41; 8: 6; Luke 9: 16; John 6: 11.
3 Luke 24: 30.
4 Eulogein and eucharistein.
5 Eucharistia.
6 Von der Goltz, *Tischgebete und Abendmahlsgebete in der altchristlichen und in der griechischen Kirche,* 1905, p. 65: "The history of table prayers

We wish merely to note the connection between the word "hymn" and the idea of thanksgiving. The Jews at their meals used to praise and thank God. This they did in a special manner at the most important meal of the year, the Pasch. Jesus as head of His little community carries on this custom of the fathers.

Part of the ritual was a singing of psalms [7] by all those present. Jesus, conforming to this practice, joined with His disciples in this form of divine praise. And in this sense Jesus did pray in common with His disciples.

Apart from these traditional Old Testament prayers, we find no prayer of Jesus in which He includes Himself and His disciples. The only satisfactory explanation of this fact is to be found in the self-consciousness of Jesus. It is not the purpose of our investigation to enter more deeply into this question. For the understanding of the prayer of the early Christian community, we need merely notice that Jesus, notwithstanding the uniqueness of His life of prayer, did nevertheless join with His disciples in singing the traditional psalms.

Of still greater importance for understanding community prayer in the primitive Church is an investigation of what Jesus taught concerning prayer in common. Jesus spoke beautifully about prayer, particularly about prayer in common. Besides the far-reaching influence of His life of prayer and the practices of the Jewish synagogue, His teaching made community prayer the religious foundation of Christian community life for all time.

---

shows how permanent was the impression left by our Lord's use of the customary prayers inherited from the fathers."

[7] Cf., for example, the following passages: Ps. 103: 27; 135: 25; 144: 15.

Jesus said: "Again I say to you, if two of you are united on earth about anything for which they ask, it shall be done for them by My Father in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." [8] It is not possible to determine what was the occasion of this logion which stands in a long and varied series of dialogues and sayings. But if we consider its relation with other similar expressions regulating the conduct of members of the community toward one another, we may easily conclude that the form of this logion was influenced by the practice of community prayer among Christians before the Gospel was written.

Further, we are not justified in considering it a copy of a Jewish model. It is true that the following sentence has sometimes been referred to as such a model: "When they sit at table and words of the Torah are their subject of conversation, then the Shekina comes down upon them." [9] But this passage from the Talmud contains no mention of prayer. Secondly, the sentence probably arose at a time when outward, merely external, observance of the Law was at its fullest development. This one sentence alone, when contrasted with the Gospel passages quoted above, shows us how much loftier and deeper was the spirituality of Jesus and His disciples. Thirdly, the contents of this Jewish parallel text, without any mention of prayer, fails utterly to teach the power of community prayer as an influence in the building up of the community.

[8] Matt. 18: 19.
[9] Mal. 3: 16; pirke aboth.

The meaning of the Christian logion, on the contrary, is this: the community knows itself to be inwardly united with one another and with its glorified Lord. The highest sign of this unity, the most precious fruit thereof, is common prayer in the name of Jesus, prayer which is simultaneously confession to Him and union with Him. The certainty they have of being united to Him in prayer makes them hope without doubt of being heard. They feel that this certainty is a confirmation of His word that their prayer in common will be answered. What the text then reveals is not primarily their outward assembling, although this outward union is both occasion and consequence of the situation revealed by the logion itself. Still less does the logion reveal a mere outward common occupation in some act of worship. What it does reveal is rather the inward unity of the community through their union with their Lord. This inward sense of union gives them the certainty of being heard by the Father of that Lord, who dwells in their midst. Hence we have here the same idea that appears elsewhere in the first days of Christianity.[10]

It is easy to show that this idea rests on the words of Jesus. Often, particularly in His farewell discourse, He emphasized the union of His disciples with Him and with one another as the fundamental law of His kingdom and as the starting point of their activity. Often, too, He assigned to the community union a special influence on their relation to the Father. This is the truth on which our present logion insists.

In the parallel text (Mark 11: 25) we find the com-

[10] I Cor. 5: 4.

mand to forgive one another expressed as follows: "Forgive, if you have aught against any man, that your Father also, who is in heaven, may forgive you your sins." Evidently we have here the same conception as appears in the corresponding petition of the Lord's Prayer. If this command of mutual forgiveness has been fulfilled, if, in other words, the community is again one with the glorified Lord, then "whatsoever you ask shall come unto you" (Mark 11: 24). These texts show beyond doubt that Jesus attaches a special importance and value to common prayer. Let us note four elements in the bond uniting the community at prayer. First, we have the same inward spirit. Secondly, we have the same contents.[11] Thirdly, we have oneness of place. Fourthly, we have oneness of time. Jesus said: "If two of you are united on earth about anything whatsoever for which they ask, it shall be done for them by My Father in heaven." These words of our Lord are a complete testimony to the value He assigns to common prayer.

THE OUR FATHER

But we have not yet given the classical text for the importance which Jesus assigned to common prayer. There is a prayer wherein He Himself explains to His disciples what He means by this harmony and union. This classical text, this exemplar of prayer of a Christian community, is the prayer which He bequeathed to His Church and which the Church calls simply the Lord's Prayer. It is found in Matthew and Luke.

[11] Matt. 18:19.

Matt. 6: 9–13	Luke 11: 2–4
9. Our Father in heaven, hallowed be Thy name,	2. Father, hallowed be Thy name,
10. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.	Thy kingdom come.
11. Give us this day our daily bread,	3. Give us each day our daily bread,
12. and forgive us our debts, as we have forgiven our debtors	4. and forgive us our sins for we likewise forgive every debtor of ours.
13. And lead us not into temptation but deliver us from the evil one.	And lead us not into temptation.

At first glance we see that these forms, whether we consider either of them by itself or note their agreement in language and content, both give us a community prayer which in its contents goes back to the teaching and example of Jesus. From this point of view questions of literary criticism are of secondary importance. Whether the form in Luke or that in Matthew [12] was the earlier does not militate against the view that this traditional prayer was used by the Christians and must be referred to Jesus as its author.

Let us note that the very literary style of this prayer shows it to be a community prayer. In the spirit of the good tidings preached by Jesus, announcing that all men are children of God, the prayer in both forms is directed to God our Father. It is true that in Luke the

[12] The form in the *Didache* agrees almost word by word with that in Matthew.

prayer begins, "Father," without the word "our." But that Luke means "our Father" appears from the historical occasion he assigns to the prayer. Matthew makes the prayer part of the Sermon on the Mount. According to Luke the occasion for the prayer is the petition of one of the disciples who saw the Master praying: "Lord, teach us to pray, even as John likewise taught his disciples" (Luke 11: 1). When, therefore, Jesus answers: "When ye pray, say, Father," He addresses Himself to His disciples, urging each of them to call God, Father. Consequently Luke's word "Father" means, "our Father." From this petition of the disciples who wish to be taught to pray as John taught his disciples to pray, we see clearly that, although we cannot say in detail how John's disciples prayed, nevertheless we must understand that the disciples of Jesus desired a formulary of prayer, in the same sense as other masters composed prayer formulas for their disciples. Such prayers by their intention and occasion have community significance. Hence the "Father" in Luke must be understood as "our Father." Those who recite this prayer thereby show that they are disciples of Jesus and children of God.

The petitions which follow this invocation agree in this, that they refer to the kingdom of God and His children. They form two groups. The petitions of the first group are not connected by "and"; those of the second group are connected by "and."

The first series of petitions refers to God, the Father and the Ruler of this kingdom, and prays for its coming. The second series refers to all men who are willing

to fulfil its demands with confidence in God's fatherly help, to whom they resign themselves, expecting from Him alone their daily bread. This confidence it is which binds those that pray into one family of brothers, which leads each one to put his own wishes into the background and to express only those which, as a member of this family, he shares with all others: our Father, our bread, our debts, our debtors, our temptation. The thought of self is suppressed; the prayer speaks in the name of all brothers, for all citizens of God's kingdom, for all children of the Father. The Lord's Prayer is the prayer of a community which knows that it is united in the Father.

The expressions that are common to both formulations of the Our Father are the following: "Give us this day our daily bread; forgive us our debts, as we have forgiven our debtors; and lead us not into temptation." This series of petitions is distinguished by the conjunction "and." A further mark of unity is to be found in the pronoun employed ("us," "our"). This structure is characteristic of the spirit of this prayer. It begs the same gifts for all children of the same Father. It expresses this attitude of children and the consequent brotherly relation to one another. This attitude is the condition for God's answering their petitions, since only the Father's goodness is the reason they assign for the remission of their sins. They have the right to appeal to this goodness of the Father as soon as they are united as brothers by mutual forgiveness of offenses. Surely the petition shows them as true children of this Father.

In contents, too, these phrases are expressions of community prayer. They are a petition in the most simple childlike form, in a form accommodated to the understanding of all disciples of Jesus, a petition for those chief gifts which are so valuable to every Christian under all conditions and at all times: God's kingdom, the means of life, forgiveness of sins.

Thus the Lord's Prayer shows plainly that Jesus teaches community prayer, not merely in the sense that only a member of a definite community, the community of His disciples, can pray in this fashion, but also in this sense, that the prayer itself presupposes a community of disciples. Community prayer comes from Jesus as its source, for undoubtedly the community did not create it but inherited it from Jesus. Not only is each petition in full harmony with the teaching of Jesus, but the prayer expresses the well-known triple refrain found so often in His public prayers: Father, Thy kingdom, Thy will.

But we must go further, we must maintain that the entire form as given to us goes back to Jesus as its author. For, whatever may be said about the twofold form in which the Our Father has been handed down, its essential parts have a common source. This source is not merely oral, but must have been reduced to writing very early. This view is proved by the presence of the word *epiousios* ("daily"), which is not found outside the New Testament, and which in the New Testament occurs only here. Consequently the form of the Our Father in Matthew and Luke goes back to one common source. If this is granted, we have likewise the proof that the

other petitions in Matthew and Luke, since they agree in contents and form, also go back to this same source, namely, our Lord's own words which were retained by His hearers in this fashion and in no other. We would thus have a psychological proof of the opinion which G. Klein expresses in the following words: "The disciples of Jesus preserved this prayer as their holiest treasure. After His death it became their most precious inheritance left by their Master to His first community." [13] Further, on the basis of textual criticism, we have a proof that the Our Father, at least in the elements common to both forms, gives us our Lord's very words.

Having found that Matthew and Luke are in agreement as to the contents and form of the prayer, we are led back to a time when liturgical usage had already set its stamp on this prayer and put it beyond the reach of change. Slight verbal variations do not militate against this view. Hence the Our Father, as a community prayer, has Jesus as its immediate author.

[13] *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,* 1906, p. 49.

CHAPTER III

JEWISH PIETY

THE TEMPLE

SINCE the days of the return from exile, the Jews lived under the egis of the reconstruction of the Temple. So prominent was the Temple and all that belonged to it as the center of Jewish piety, that to one foreign observer the Jewish community was a hierocracy in the proper sense of the word.[1] In the division of duties priests were ministers of the public worship of Jahve. The most important religious functions were the continual liturgical sacrifices. Duties of the laity were chiefly external services, offerings for the Temple and the priesthood, circumcision and Sabbath observance, and many kinds of private sacrifice.

The exactness and fidelity with which these services were performed and the value assigned to external piety led to formalism, that formalism which stands so prominently in the foreground when we read in the New Testament the relation of Jesus to contemporary Pharisaism.

1 Diodorus, XI, 3; cf. Bousset, *Religion des Judentums,* 1906, p. 113.

On the other hand, the pre-eminent position which the Temple service had in Jewish piety brought about such a strengthening of the community sense that individual piety retired into the background. The needs and experiences, the duties and demands, of the community came to be more and more emphasized. The one who prays is the people as a whole rather than the individual. It is a single people praying and sacrificing to Jahve because it relies on the promises given by Him to their fathers. The warm spirit of devotion, the living religious sense which we admire in so many psalms, has its roots in this feeling of union with the religious community. The individual prays to Jahve because he is a member of the religious community made one by its Temple and its sacrifice. From this source his prayer and his sacrifice receive their consecration and confidence, their assurance of being heard and accepted by Jahve. And since Jahve, who indeed holds heaven and earth in His hand, is especially near to His faithful ones in His Temple at Jerusalem, the prayer offered in the Temple has greater assurance of being heard.

Let us take a series of passages particularly from the psalms to illustrate how predominant the Temple was in the thought of the Israelites. "When my soul was in distress within me, I remembered the Lord: that my prayer might come to Thee, unto Thy holy Temple." [2] "One thing I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life." [3] "How lovely are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longeth and

[2] Jonas 2: 8.
[3] Ps. 26: 4.

fainteth for the courts of the Lord. My heart and my flesh have rejoiced in the living God." [4] "Lord, who shall dwell in Thy tabernacle? or who shall rest in Thy holy hill? He that walketh without blemish, and worketh justice. He that speaketh truth in his heart." [5] "Who shall ascend into the mount of the Lord: or who shall stand in his holy place? The innocent in hands, and clean of heart, who hath not taken his soul in vain." [6] "I rejoice at the things that were said to me: we shall go into the house of the Lord." [7]

Prayers like these show how deep and ardent was the Israelite's longing for the Temple of his God. It would be easy to illustrate the matter further. For instance, we might quote psalm 78, which expresses so vehemently his horror at the profanation of the sanctuary.[8] Or we might refer to songs of praise like psalms 46 and 47 which sing with enthusiasm the greatness of Jahve in His Temple. Everything that in any way has relation to the liturgy in the Temple arouses this enthusiasm and attracts the most loving attention of the sacred writers: the high priest and his vestments, the choirs of singers, the cymbals, the harps, the lyres, the festive swaying multitude, the sacrifice itself, and the vessels of sacrifice.

This trait of Judaism remained in later times. The Jews never lost their unique love for their Temple and the service of God in the Temple. To the pious Israelite nothing is more abhorrent than the abomination of

[4] Ps. 83: 2 f.
[5] Ps. 14: 1 f.
[6] Ps. 23: 3.
[7] Ps. 121: 1.
[8] Cf. Ps. 101: 15.

desolation in the holy place. For nothing does he pray so ardently as for the renovation and reconstruction of the Temple. And in the New Testament we note in so many places the pride of the Jew in the splendor and permanence of the Temple. We may note this sentiment in the admiring words of Jesus' disciples,[9] and in many other places in the New Testament.[10]

Even when far away, they did not lose their connection with the Temple. Through their Temple tribute they felt themselves united to the daily sacrifice. An evidence of this feeling was the institution of delegations to attend the Temple worship, as we learn from the Mishna. According to this description, the entire population was formed into twenty-four divisions corresponding to the twenty-four divisions of priests. When the time came for each delegation to go to Jerusalem for their turn in the Temple, those who remained at home gathered at the same hour in their synagogues for reading the Scripture and for prayer.[11] Furthermore, every male Israelite had the duty of appearing in the national sanctuary on each of the three great feasts (Deut. 16: 16; Luke 2: 41 f.). On these feast days, especially on the Pasch, the Jews of the Diaspora came in great multitudes to the Temple in Jerusalem.[12]

THE SYNAGOGUE

Since Jewish piety was so closely interwoven with their conception of the Temple, we might wonder that

[9] Mark 13: 1.
[10] Mark 11: 11; 11: 15 ff.; 13: 14; Matt. 24: 15; Apoc. 11: 1.
[11] Taanith, IV, 1–4; Schürer, II, 280.
[12] Cf. Philo, *De monarchia*, II, 1.

it was not lost with the ruin of the Temple. If, as matter of fact, it did not perish, but rather blossomed anew, we must find the reason in Jewish faithfulness to the Law and the synagogue.

We might be tempted to think a priori that the union between Jewish piety and the Temple sacrifices sought at the time of the Exile some poor substitute by founding other places of prayer. In other words, we might think the synagogue owed its origin to the fact of exile. But there are many historical arguments against accepting this view. In any case, at the period of the New Testament we find the synagogues as long existing edifices in all the more important cities of Palestine and likewise in the greater cities of the Diaspora. All of them have their definite order of divine service on the Sabbath, emphasizing, not sacrifice as they had done in the Temple, but teaching and prayer. This change in the understanding and practice of divine service is important. The synagogue is the home of prayer without sacrifice. We must indeed modify the significance of this truth. For the practice of reading and expounding the Law gained such importance that the house of prayer became almost a school, almost a court of justice.[13] In other words, we may speak almost of a worship of the Law. But there is no more important truth in the history of the religion of later Judaism, none more important in the general religious history of this epoch than the rise of the synagogue beside the Temple.

The two main elements of the synagogal worship are doctrine and prayer. The central position in doctrine

[13] Matt. 10: 17: 23: 34.

is occupied by one of the 154 sections into which the Torah is divided for the purpose of a three-year cycle of readings. The official reader was selected by the ruler of the synagogue. Next after the reading from the Law followed a passage from the Prophets, whose writings were considered not as prophecies, but as an explanation and ethical application of the Law. We are familiar with the usage of the New Testament writers to call all the Old Testament writings by the name of the Law and the Prophets. After these two readings, there followed an oral exposition of the passages read. This function became in ever growing measure a privilege of the scribes, who thus had opportunity to set forth their conception of the Law and to train the people in their spirit. The fourth and fifth elements, the last remains of the former liturgical splendor, were common prayer and the priestly blessing.

THE LAW

This short sketch shows what elements of Jewish piety began to succeed the Temple liturgy and came to be predominant: love and reverence for the written word of God and for the traditions of the fathers. But this liberation from the predominating Temple liturgy [14] did not lead to true religious freedom. On the contrary, the change led to a state of bondage to the Law, which, particularly for the lower classes, became a painful slavery to very many external prescriptions. It is true, the

[14] The prophets had used sharp words against a merely external observance of Temple sacrifices. Cf. Is. 1: 10–18; Jer. 7: 4–17.

esteem for the Law had always been a special characteristic of Jewish piety. But in later developments of Judaism on into the New Testament period this element turns more and more from liturgy to doctrine and to a mere legalistic piety. In the end the external observance chokes the essence of piety.

Especially for the most delicate and interior element in all piety, this hard yoke of the Law, this merely external form of religion, became the greatest danger. Prayer became simply one sort of good works and was put in the same class with fasting and almsgiving.

Thus prayer, instead of being purified by its separation from the Temple sacrifice, became by its union with the Law a mere external matter like the Law itself. "Much Torah, much life," the saying of Hillel,[15] is characteristic for the piety of later Judaism. The specific trait of Israelite piety is reverence for the Law. Scripture passages in which the sacred author was referring to the liturgy, the Temple, and Mount Sion, are transferred to the Law. Thus we find it stated that the Law was announced by the angels, that it is eternal and unchangeable, that it is the greatest miracle of God on earth, a pre-existent heavenly being, a mirror of the cosmic order, the hope and pride of the pious Jew.[16]

To show how great was the reverence for the Law, we have but to consult certain pseudoepigraphic books composed at this time. The Book of the Jubilees, for instance, presents the patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) as observing all the ceremonial precepts of the

[15] Pirke aboth, II, 7.

[16] IV Esd. 3: 18 f.; II Bar. 17; Asc. Mosis, 1: 11; Pirke aboth, 6: 10; cf. Acts 7: 30, 38, 53; Rom. 6: 14; Heb. 2: 2.

Law. The Fourth Book of Machabees insists on the power which the Law of the fathers has over human instincts. The entire letter of Aristeas magnifies the power of the Law, describing it as divine, spotless, and full of wisdom. Again the Psalms of Solomon give us a faithful picture of a piety which expresses itself in merely external Pharisaic fashion. Some characteristic examples are to be found in the Fourth Book of Esdras. For example, only the just who observe the Law shall have a share in the blissful age to come.[17] The mercy which the author shows to sinners is a consequence of his uncertainty in regard to his own salvation. But it is likewise illuminating in regard to the broken spirit which is to be noted in the pious Jews of that later period, when they had reached a state of despair in which they realized the impossibility of perfectly fulfilling the Law. These thoughts are familiar to readers of the letters to the Galatians and to the Romans.

It is a trait of late Jewish piety that the Law, originally ethical in tone, becomes chiefly ceremonial. As numerous passages in the New Testament indicate, all possibilities and eventualities of daily complicated life are carefully considered. The sanctity of the Sabbath and of feast days, the prescriptions about tithes, about what is clean and what is unclean, about eating and drinking, about the vessels to be used, about cleanliness of the body, all these are developed into their most remote details. And, as these same passages show, the outward observance is generally felt to be quite sufficient.

Piety becomes legal formalism. All religion becomes

[17] IV Esd. 7: 17.

a legal process between the pious man and God. This development was favored by the importance which the Law as a written code had attained for the Jewish people. The scribes were teachers of the Law, the theologians were lawyers. As in all such similar developments, where religion becomes too closely associated with law, the interior attitude toward God was determined by the legal fulfilment of casuistic details prescribed by a written and traditional law. The idea of justice did not have reference to the inward religious attitude toward God, but rather to external observance of the many and manifold prescriptions of the Law. Since men cannot observe all these many commands without first knowing them, Jewish piety begins to take on a new coloring; it can be taught and must be learned. Hence doctrine replaces the liturgy. Only the man who knows, only the educated man, can be pious. Practical knowledge of life is nothing but knowledge of the Law. The learned man and his school, with the Bible as text, the scribe who in the synagogue service interprets the Law, these are the bearers and promoters of piety. Seen from this viewpoint, the phrase so often used in the New Testament, "Pharisees and scribes," is very suitable to the historical circumstances.

From all this we see the reason for many ethical views of Judaism at the time of Jesus. First of all, its attitude is negative, considering only what is not to be done. Secondly, its attitude is particularistic, despising those who do not know the Law and therefore cannot follow it. A usual question on the lips of these pietists is, "Who is my neighbor?" And when these men become mission-

aries, they are satisfied to attain merely external converts, just as their own religious attitude is founded on the external privilege of being children of Abraham. Thirdly, springing from this external piety arises a hypocritical attitude, which imposes on others burdens too heavy for men to bear, burdens that those who impose them do not themselves bear. Lastly, ensues a confusion of all values, a confusion which no longer distinguishes what is little from what is great, and which consequently makes complete ethical development and maturity impossible. A few great personalities do indeed preserve the inner attitude of their will to God and do not break down under the external yoke.

In our consideration of prayer and liturgy in the primitive Church, we must consider two forms of Jewish piety in the time of Jesus. One form is that determined by the Temple and its liturgy. The other is connected with the synagogue and the Law. These two do not always stand out sharply one against the other, but often influence each other or even merge one into the other. The chief representatives of the liturgy are the Sadducees and the priests. Those who more closely represent the piety connected with the synagogue and the Law are the Pharisees and scribes. With both of these tendencies Jesus came into conflict, but for different reasons. And this opposition compelled Him to clarify His own relation to the Temple, the synagogue, and the Law. And since this attitude of Jesus is essential for the understanding of the primitive Christian liturgy, we must here attempt to outline it more clearly.

CHAPTER IV

JESUS' RELATION TO THE JEWISH PIETY OF HIS TIME

IT is not easy to paint a clear picture of the relations of Jesus to contemporary Judaism. The first impression we get from the sources is that of an apparently contradictory attitude on our Lord's part. At times He seems to reject the Law, at other times to accept it. From this source arises a difficulty, even the impossibility of giving a brief final judgment on the relation in which Jesus stands to the Old Testament. One source of this obscurity lies in the various views which later readers, later Christians, had with regard to the religious value of the Old Testament. Another source lies in the rapid succession of great events at the time of Jesus. A third source lies in the slow growth of comprehension by the New Testament writers and in the sketchiness of their accounts. Let us take by way of illustration the discussion regarding the circumcision of the Gentiles. According to the intrinsic importance which a person gave to this question and according to his temperament, the disciples of Jesus attained to understanding, some more rapidly, some more slowly. Some might lay par-

ticular stress upon the statement in Matt. 5: 17 ("I came not to destroy, but to fulfil"); others, upon the words in Matt. 26: 29 ("I shall not drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of My Father"). A similar contrast might be noted between John 4: 35–38 and Apoc. 2: 12. In the former passage we read: "Behold I say to you, lift up your eyes, and see the fields, how they are white unto harvest. . . . I have sent you to reap that whereon ye have not labored; others have labored, and ye are entered into their labor." The latter passage is a triumphant song of the New Jerusalem. In what follows we will attempt to sketch the entire subject with restriction to our present problem, the position of Jesus with regard to the Old Testament liturgy.

JESUS AND THE TEMPLE

The sources at our command give us the following picture. Even from the days of His youth the Temple was familiar to Him as the house of God. He grew up in a family which kept faithfully to the tradition of sanctifying the Jewish festal days by visiting the Temple. He was inured to the conception of the Temple as a place for adoring God. He considered the liturgy therein as God's work.[1] It was to Him a house of prayer, a place of preference for those who worship God in truth.[2] The profanation of the Temple aroused His holy indignation.[3] His heart loved the Temple, even the magnifi-

[1] Luke 2: 41 f., 49; Matt. 23: 21.
[2] John 4: 21 f.
[3] Matt. 21: 12 f.

cence of its architecture.[4] A few days before His death, He inspected its courts lovingly, looking at everything in detail.[5] He paid the Temple tax, as we see clearly in Peter's prompt answer to the question of the tax-gatherers.[6] On the other hand, we find no statement which shows beyond doubt that Jesus Himself prayed in the Temple. But we do find that He often taught in the courts of the Temple. As it was a common Jewish custom for groups of teachers and pupils to gather somewhere in the great edifice,[7] so Jesus also taught in the Temple.[8]

Thus on the feast of Dedication we find Him teaching in the Porch of Solomon.[9] Again in the last days of the feast of Tabernacles He was teaching in the midst of a joyful multitude.[10] Another time He taught in the vicinity of the treasury.[11] According to the accounts in Matthew (21: 17), Luke (21: 37), and John (8: 1), He loved to divide His time in Jerusalem so as to spend the night on Mount Olivet and the day in the Temple. In the early morning He instructed the people who came for the morning sacrifice. Then during the course of the day new groups would form around Him, sometimes made up of His adversaries. At other times He would heal the sick. But He also had time for quiet contemplation.[12] We know that after His ascension the disci-

4 Mark 13: 2.
5 Mark 11: 11.
6 Matt. 17: 24 ff.
7 Luke 2: 46.
8 Matt. 21: 23; Luke 19: 47; John 7: 14.
9 John 10: 22 f.
10 John 7: 37.
11 John 8: 20.
12 Mark 12: 41.

ples went often and gladly to the Temple.[13] Jesus seems to suppose that His disciples take part in the Jewish liturgy.[14] Further, the long continued attachment of Jewish Christianity to circumcision and the Sabbath shows that the cause which led finally to their separation from the Temple was not so much reflection on the incompatibility between the old Jewish liturgy and the new Christian liturgy, but rather the destruction of the Temple itself and consequently the end of the Jewish priesthood.

We cannot maintain that for Jesus the Temple was merely a convenient place for His ministry. This view is refuted by the scene [15] where Jesus cleanses the Temple. We see here how He breaks down ancient custom. Strange indeed it must have seemed to the Jews to condemn men whose activities were necessary for the liturgical sanctity of the Temple, to condemn even the servants of the Temple for carrying through it the necessary vessels. His action, prompted by His reverence for the Temple as God's dwelling, shows that He felt Himself greater than the Temple. This same conclusion is supported by the Gospel accounts which show that Jesus chose other places of prayer. We notice even that the accounts explicitly refer to this as His custom. Still more clearly does this view appear in the episode with the Samaritan woman. Jesus commands adoration of God in spirit and in truth as independent of all external places, even of the Temple in Jerusalem.[16]

[13] Acts 2: 46; 3: 1; 22: 17.
[14] Matt. 5: 23.
[15] Matt. 21: 13; Mark 11: 16 ff.; Luke 19: 46.
[16] John 4: 21 ff.

The same idea appears in the distinct prediction of the ruin of the Temple.[17] In giving this prediction, He goes back to a statement found in Micheas (3: 12) and in Jeremias (7: 14; 26: 18) and He maintains this prediction in the hour of His death. Let us note the way this destruction is expressed in His trial before the Sanhedrin.[18] Let us note further "the fanatical veneration for the Temple which prevailed in wide circles of later Judaism." [19] In Jewish hearts like these, such a prediction seemed absurd and brought forth the greatest opposition.[20] Only when the prediction was expressed in the form of metaphor was it possible even for the disciples to understand it.[21] Yet this prediction is intimated much earlier,[22] when in discussion with the Pharisees Jesus says: "But I tell you, there is here something greater than the Temple." Even if we interpret the passage as expressing the superiority of the command of love over all liturgical duties, it remains nevertheless a strong expression of Jesus' attitude of independence toward the Temple and its liturgy. We have here a conception of piety and religion that is not bound to any external circumstance. We have the very opposite of that Pharisaical disposition which brings to the lips of Jesus the words of Isaias:

> This people honoreth me with their lips,
> but their heart is far from me;

17 Matt. 24: 2; Mark 13: 2; Luke 21: 6.
18 Matt. 26: 61; 27: 40; Mark 14: 58.
19 Schmitz, *Opferanschauung des späteren Judentums,* 1910, p. 199.
20 Mark 14: 60.
21 John 2: 21.
22 Matt. 12: 6.

In vain do they worship me,
teaching as doctrines the precepts of men.[23]

This position of Jesus is so much the more emphatic since otherwise He shows such loving understanding for all genuine expressions of piety that in any way belong to the Temple liturgy. Never did He condemn sacrifice in the Temple or any of the other customary practices of the liturgy. On the contrary, where the external acts were prompted by proper dispositions, He had words of approval and praise. The commendation, for instance, which He gives to the poor widow who casts her gift into the Temple treasury[24] would be otherwise inconceivable. In the Sermon on the Mount[25] we have an approval of liturgical sacrifice. In Mark 7: 11 f. (cf. Matt. 15: 5) we find expressions that approve of gifts to the Temple as good and praiseworthy.

In these same passages, however, we see the beginning of a revision of the traditional values. In all these passages our Lord draws the attention of His contemporaries to a truth that for them was not at all self-evident. The truth is this: the commandment of charity is higher than all liturgical precepts. The command to cherish and love parents stands higher than all gifts to the Temple. The obligation to love our neighbor stands higher than all sacrificial precepts. He who is not reconciled with his brother[26] must not enter in before the face of God either in prayer or in sacrifice. The same thought appears still more clearly and impressively in Matt.

[23] Matt. 15: 7, 9.
[24] Mark 12: 41 ff.
[25] Matt. 5: 23 f.; cf. Matt. 23: 18 f.
[26] Matt. 5: 23, 25.

9: 13, where Jesus says: "Learn again what it means, mercy I will and not sacrifice." Again let us notice our Lord's approval of the interpretation given by the scribe [27] to the first and greatest commandment: "To love one's neighbor as one's self is far more than all holocausts and sacrifices." This interpretation our Lord approves with the words, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God."

Still it is true that Jesus condemns less often the views of Sadducees and priests than He does the doctrinal piety of the Pharisees and scribes. He condemns, it would seem, the upholders of the Law more than He does the defenders of the liturgy. And even in cases where He Himself does not follow the precepts of the Law and their Pharisaical interpretation about what is clean and what is unclean,[28] He still insists that those whom He benefits should respect the priests' right to pronounce sentence of cleanness and to receive the gift of sacrifice. It is possible to explain His insistence on the first as being in the interest of the man who had been made clean. But His insistence on the second point shows an emphasis tending to separation from the traditional Jewish attitude toward Temple piety. Some period of time was needed before the new development became known and pronounced. In course of time Jesus' method did, as a matter of fact, lead to a break with the entire contemporary system of piety, not only of the Pharisees in their relations with the Law, but also of that of the Sadducees in their relation to the Temple.

[27] Mark 12: 33.
[28] Matt. 8: 1 ff.; Mark 1: 40 ff.; Luke 5: 12 ff.

In the Acts of the Apostles (6: 13 f.) we find a first step of this development when Stephen is accused of constantly speaking against the Law and the Temple, and when Jesus is said to destroy the traditions of the Temple and the fathers.

From the viewpoint of the Jewish courts we see that the activity of Jesus is connected both with an attack against the Temple and with a conflict against the Law. Justly so. Hence when we look back at Jesus' statements about the Temple, we see that His approval, however many things it may have sanctioned, was after all only conditional. High above all these external actions was the attitude of reverence for God, which must animate all liturgical and sacrificial customs. Fulfilment of the duties toward God and our neighbor is supreme. Nevertheless, however often these words of piety reappear, we find that they still contain a loving attitude toward the Temple. Hence we are not surprised when we come to the period of the Apostles' activity to see that Peter does not draw the same conclusions as James does regarding the attitude to be derived from that of Jesus. Nor does James draw the same conclusions that Paul does. Hence the question is justified, whether the New Testament sources alone, independently of living tradition, show definitely what conclusions are to be drawn from the attitude of Jesus. This question will reappear frequently on later pages. But, however it may be solved, we have one sure result of the investigation we have so far been pursuing. Not the external work, not even the sacred liturgical

work, is for Jesus the deciding element, but the disposition of the soul from which those works proceed.

JESUS AND THE SYNAGOGUE

Jesus entered into the community of the synagogue, attending liturgical service just like other Jews. It is even noted as His custom that He goes into the synagogue on the Sabbath.[29] Two such visits to the synagogue are signalized, one in His home town, Nazareth,[30] the other in His favorite city, Capharnaum.[31] The program of the synagogue service offered Him the most suitable opportunity to exercise His teaching activity. Consequently He teaches nowhere so often and so gladly as He does in the synagogues.[32] Accounts which mention the synagogues as places for preaching the kingdom of God and also as scenes of a number of miracles, occur over and over again.[33] There was nothing unusual in this procedure. The synagogue was traditionally the place for every teacher. Hence when Jesus adopted this custom He did no more than place Himself in the ranks of the teachers.

The details of one such visit of Jesus to the synagogue are given us by St. Luke (4:15). Jesus is in Nazareth together with the community in the synagogue on the Sabbath. The reading of the passage from

[29] Luke 4: 16.
[30] Matt. 13: 54; Mark 6: 2; Luke 4: 16.
[31] Mark 1: 21; John 6: 59.
[32] John 18: 20.
[33] Matt. 4: 23; 9: 35; 12: 9 f.; Mark 1: 38 f.; 3: 1; Luke 4: 44; 6: 6; 13: 10.

the Law officially assigned to this day is over. Jesus rises—no invitation by the president of the synagogue is mentioned—to read a passage from the Prophets. The clerk offers Him the roll containing the prophecies of Isaias. He unrolls it till He comes to the passage which He reads (61: 1 f.). Then He gives the book back to the clerk and sits down according to the custom of Jewish teachers, as a sign that He now wishes to explain the passage just read. All eyes are fixed on Him while He reads and speaks. In the end He is rewarded with enthusiastic applause, mingled with which we can feel the admiration of those who saw and heard a fellow-townsman, a son of Joseph, in such eminence.[34] But very rapidly their feelings are reversed. Some sort of altercation arises which we find it hard to understand clearly because the accounts are too brief. What we do know is that the scene ended with the expulsion of Jesus from the synagogue and His departure from the city.

The astonishment of the hearers which St. Luke notes on this occasion at Nazareth, he notes also in his account of the Sabbath service at Capharnaum. St. Luke says explicitly, "Jesus taught with authority." [35] It is clear that by these words he does not mean the scribes' ordinary authority to read and to teach, but rather something very special in Jesus' manner of teaching. This view is confirmed by the still clearer statement in Mark (1: 22), where we are told that all were astounded because Jesus taught "as one having authority, and not as the scribes." The statement in Mat-

[34] Luke 4: 22.
[35] Luke 4: 32.

thew (7: 29) at the end of the Sermon on the Mount is equally explicit. Other passages which signalize the special impression of Jesus' words on the people are found in all four Evangelists.[36]

We are not told wherein Jesus' method differed from that of the scribes. But from the context of all the passages mentioned, we may derive a safe conclusion. The difference is first a sense of wonderment that Jesus knows and explains the Scriptures without having Himself pursued a course of study.[37] Secondly, there is something in His manner of knowing and explaining that they had not yet seen in any of their scribes. Their sense of wonder passes over into admiration. Here they have a teacher who seems to possess the Scriptures as His own, with which He may do as He pleases. His mere word guarantees truth; He proclaims an inner unity between Himself and Scripture. He explains the Scripture by showing that it is fulfilled in Himself.

This is the new characteristic element of His exegesis. And although it is so new, no one dares to contradict Him; [38] they feel the truth of what He claims, namely, that His teaching mission comes directly from God, whose Holy Spirit has come upon Him that He may preach the approaching kingdom of God [39] even when He, the despised and outcast, preaches against the official religious Judaism.[40] All this is included in Mark's statement (1: 27) that Christ's teaching was

[36] Matt. 13: 54; 22: 22; Mark 6: 2; 11: 18; Luke 19: 48; 20: 26; John 7: 15, 46.

[37] John 7: 15.

[38] Mark 1: 25; Luke 4: 34.

[39] Luke 4: 18 f.

[40] Matt. 5: 1 ff.; Luke 4: 18; John 7: 49.

new, with authority. For the Jewish hearer one of two interpretations was possible. First, He who thus speaks without having passed through the wisdom of the Jewish schools has His mission and doctrine directly from God, a consequence which Jesus Himself expresses when He says,[41] "My teaching is not Mine, but His who sent Me." If this view is rejected, the only other view possible is that expressed by His enemies, namely, that He who so teaches is of the devil, a friend of publicans and sinners,[42] filled not with divine but with diabolical spirit.[43]

Possibly the best passage to illustrate the relation of Jesus to the Scripture is Matt. 4: 4, according to which man lives, not by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God. We have in these words first that Jesus regards all He has as coming from the Father. We have, secondly, the truth that the events in His life were regarded by His disciples as the fulfilment of the Old Testament. We have, thirdly and especially, a striking illustration of the peculiar way Jesus applied the Scriptures to Himself.

In further illustration of this last mentioned trait, we may cite Jesus' habit of speaking in the words of Scripture.[44] In other passages we find Him saying that the Scripture must be fulfilled in Him, or that it is at that moment actually being fulfilled in Him.[45] In still other passages He says He must needs so act that the

[41] John 7: 16.
[42] Matt. 11: 19; Luke 7: 34.
[43] John 7: 20; 8: 48–59: 10: 20 f.
[44] Matt. 4: 4, 6, 7, 10; 15: 7; 21: 13; Mark 7: 6.
[45] Matt. 22: 41 ff.; 23: 39; 26: 64; Mark 4: 11 f.; Luke 4: 17 f.; 7 22 ff.; John 5: 46.

Scripture may be fulfilled.[46] From all these passages it is evident that this mode of acting proceeded from our Lord's awareness of His Messiahship. And not merely in His own life, but also in the lives of His disciples Jesus sees the Scripture fulfilled. The son of perdition, He says, is lost, in order that the Scripture may be fulfilled.[47] Evidently His disciples were persuaded that Jesus lived and acted in the spirit of the Scripture.

Our Lord's comprehensive knowledge of Scripture often leads Him to address even the Jewish Scripture experts with questions like these: Have you not read? How is it written? What dost thou read? [48] Further, He was able easily to follow their interpretation and to refute it. This knowledge, according to the Evangelists, was not acquired by instruction in the synagogue,[49] but by innate familiarity with all that Scripture contains. In His interpretations, we see not so much the letter as the spirit. Just as He regards His preaching as a continuation of the prophetic preaching,[50] so His teaching stands high above the traditional exegesis, which He at times condemns as ignorance.[51] Behind the entire history of salvation, behind the Law and the Prophets, stands God. The contents and summary of the entire Scripture is the love of God and neighbor.[52] Hence Scripture must be read in the spirit of God. Jesus in-

[46] Matt. 16: 21; 21: 1–11; 22: 29; 26: 24, 31, 54; Luke 18: 31; 22: 37; 24: 25 ff., 44.
[47] John 17: 12.
[48] Matt. 12: 3, 5; 19: 4; 21: 42; Mark 2: 25; 12: 10, 26; Luke 6: 3; 10: 26.
[49] John 7: 15.
[50] Matt. 13: 17; Luke 10: 23, 34.
[51] Matt. 22: 29.
[52] Matt. 22: 39 f.; Mark 12: 28 ff.

fallibly finds its deepest meaning, its eternal contents, truth that is independent of all time and place.

But let us not expect from Jesus questions and answers that interest chiefly the scientific critics of the Bible. For Jesus, Scripture is the word that comes from God and leads to God. All else lies outside His purpose. Only what concerned His relation to God did He select from the past and transmit to His hearers. Jesus regards Himself as the central figure of the Scripture.[53] He illustrates His gospel from the Old Testament writings, He applies all the religious truths derived from them to Himself. Let not, therefore, the critical scholar expect to find new literary discoveries when Jesus reads the Old Testament in the spirit of the New Testament. Questions of this kind did not enter into His purpose.[54] For Jesus it is sufficient to know God's will in Scripture, which cannot be broken or destroyed.[55]

JESUS AND THE LAW

Jesus came not to destroy the Law but to fulfil it.[56] But His conception of the Law and its exegesis led to the abrogation of the Law as it was then understood.

He condemns the scribes in these words: [57] "Woe to you, lawyers, because you have taken away the key of knowledge; yourselves have not entered, and those en-

[53] John 5: 39 ff.
[54] Matt. 13: 14; 19: 18; 22: 43 f.; Mark 7: 6; 10: 3 f.; 12: 26, 36; Luke 20: 42.
[55] John 10: 35.
[56] Matt. 5: 17.
[57] Matt. 23: 13.

tering ye have hindered." This condemnation shows that He has the key whereby rightly to understand the Law and interpret it.

It was the common belief of Israel that the Law comes from God and hence is an expression of the divine will, of the divine order established for all Jewish lives, private and public. Jesus does not condemn this belief. He wishes the Law to be kept in its full contents and scope.[58] He Himself was accustomed from His youth up to observe the Law.[59] With the formula, "What is written in the Law?" [60] He points to the observance of the Law as the foundation of morality. When asked what man must do to reach eternal life, He answers that man must observe the Law.[61] And even at a time when He stands in bitter opposition to the scribes and Pharisees, He still demands of the people that they submit to those who sit in the chair of Moses.[62] He denies entrance into the kingdom of heaven to all whose justice is not greater than that of the scribes and Pharisees. It follows further from the passage just cited that even those prescriptions of the Pharisees which went beyond the explicit Mosaic Law were to be followed in so far as they were legitimate developments of the Law.[63] Moses, He says, is the preacher and teacher sent by God, and the successors of Moses are the legitimate interpreters of the Law that

[58] Matt. 5: 18.
[59] Luke 2: 27.
[60] Luke 10: 26.
[61] Matt. 19: 17; Mark 10: 17 ff.; Luke 18: 18 ff.
[62] Matt. 23: 2.
[63] Matt. 23: 3.

shall never pass away. Rather shall heaven and earth pass away than the smallest particle of the Law.[64] He recognizes the permanent character of the Law, which it is His will not to abrogate but to fulfil.

It will be useful to take certain examples in illustration of what has been said, and also to show that Jesus' religious attitude, His union with the will of God, placed Him spiritually above the Law in understanding its meaning and in judging its obligation. "Amen I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, not one jot or one tittle shall pass away from the Law till all things come to pass." [65] Hence Jesus' position as regards the Scripture and consequently His position as regards the Law may be seen as an attitude either of obligation or of freedom. Emphasis upon the letter of the positive law is replaced by emphasis upon an unwritten and ideal spirit of the law. Moses and the prophets are the eternal foundations of religion and the representatives of the revealed moral law, but only the right spirit can read their deeper meaning. This right spirit Jesus possesses. He enters into history as the new lawgiver. The expression that occurs so often in the Gospels, "to them of old it was said, but I say to you," is not a mere literary phrase. And this fulfilment of the Law, fulfilment from within, is something new which contains in germ the abrogation of the old. And the reason is that Jesus alone knows what is the deepest meaning of the Law. Thus the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," receives a deeper meaning by the words of Jesus, "He

[64] Matt. 5: 18.
[65] *Ibid.*

who is angry at his brother is guilty of the judgment." The old commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," as interpreted by Jesus, says that he who looks upon a woman to lust after her has already broken the commandment in his heart. They of old knew that they should not bear false testimony. But this command as interpreted by Jesus condemns everything that goes beyond "yea, yea, no, no." The command of love of neighbor, which those of old understood as meaning friend, benefactor, and fellow citizen, is interpreted by Jesus of every man, even of one who is an enemy. Jesus, in a word, interprets all commands of the Mosaic Law by the standard of perfection, which is His Father in heaven.

As is evident from all these illustrations, the value of the Law lies in the right attitude toward God, not in the mere external observance. "A good tree brings forth good fruits." [66] This image expresses the fundamental thought of Jesus on morality. Not outward legality but inward loyalty is the decisive element. Thus Jesus becomes the fulfiller of the Law. Not even the smallest particle of the divine will which is contained in the precepts of the Law is lost. Rather in its innermost nature it is observed. Beneath the sun of the Gospel, it ripens to maturity.

When we come to Jesus' attitude toward the contemporaneous ceremonial law, we find the same development. He did not abrogate the ceremonial law. Rather both He and His disciples moved within the limits of that law, even within such limits as were made

[66] Matt. 7: 17.

by the interpretation of the Pharisees. Here, too, He follows the principle which He expressed at the time of His baptism: "We must fulfil all justice." [67] What He condemns is not the observance of traditional religious customs, but only the misuse which the representatives of the Law introduced into its observance. He attacks the unbearable burdens which the teachers of the Law hypocritically laid upon men. And it was this battle for the deeper meaning of the Law, for its fulfilment in the spirit of love, that led to the final break with the letter of the Law, with a fulfilment that was satisfied with external observance. This battle it was which finally lifted Jesus to a position high above Pharisaism and even high above the Baptist and the whole Jewish ceremonial Law.

In this sense Jesus is the goal of the Law. This phrase from the Epistle to the Romans (10: 4) appears in passages of the Gospels like this, "the law and the prophets until John." [68] Jesus explicitly brought something new, as appears in His answer to the question about fasting. "The disciples of John fast often and make supplications; and likewise those of the Pharisees; but yours eat and drink." He said to them: "Can you make the companions of the bridegroom fast, while the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come; and when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, then will they fast in those days." And He spoke to them a parable also: "Nobody inserts a patch from a new garment into an old garment; otherwise it tears the new

[67] Matt. 3: 13 and parallels.
[68] Luke 16: 16.

one, and also the patch from the new garment will not agree with the old. And nobody puts new wine into old wine-skins; otherwise the new wine will burst the wine-skins, and itself will be spilled and the skins will perish. But new wine must be put into fresh wine-skins. And nobody having drunk old wine, desires new; for he says, The old is good." [69]

The attitude of Christ in His battle with the Pharisees finds an especially sharp expression in His relation to the Sabbath. First of all there can be no doubt that Christ acknowledged the Sabbath. This is shown by His practice of being present in the synagogue on the Sabbath.[70] This attitude appears also in His account of the end of the world. "Pray that your flight be not in the winter or on the Sabbath." [71] This truth underlies the way He justifies His own conduct and that of His disciples. For instance, we may point to His reference to David, and to the priests [72] when the disciples were gathering the ears of corn.[73] Lastly, we may refer to His remark about circumcision, which may be performed on the Sabbath. We must remember that this reference was made on a day when He was reproached for healing a man on the Sabbath.[74]

What Jesus condemned on these occasions was not the sanctification of the Sabbath, but rather the way the Sabbath commandment was regarded by contemporaries. "Six days there are in which to work: in them

[69] Matt. 9: 14 ff.; Mark 2: 18 ff.; Luke 5: 33 ff.
[70] Mark 1: 21; Luke 4: 16, and many others.
[71] Matt. 24: 20.
[72] Matt. 12: 5.
[73] Matt. 12: 1 ff.; Mark 2: 23 ff.; Luke 6: 1 ff.
[74] John 7: 22.

therefore come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day." [75] Thus the admonition of the ruler of the synagogue. Jesus answers: "Hypocrites, does not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead it away to water it? And ought not this woman, a daughter of Abraham whom Satan has bound these eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?" [76] In similarly vivid fashion we are told with what indignation He rebuked the hardheartedness of the Pharisees on that Sabbath when He healed the man with a withered hand. On the Sabbath, He says, it is right to do good and not evil; to save a life and not sacrifice it.[77] Lastly, we may mention the case of the dropsical man, who likewise is healed on the Sabbath in the house of one of the chief Pharisees.[78]

In all these instances we are shown that the external sanctification of the Sabbath must yield in favor of an act of love. But there is a word in St. Mark which points in the direction of an abandonment of the Sabbath command. The word is as follows: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." [79] What sounds like an echo of this principle is the statement in Codex D where Jesus says to a man who is working on the Sabbath: "Man, if you know what you are doing, you are blessed; but if you do not know, you are cursed, a transgressor of the Law." [80] A still sharper word against the Sabbath is found in St. John. Jesus, who

[75] Luke 13: 14.
[76] Luke 13: 15 f.
[77] Matt. 12: 9 ff.; Mark 3: 1 ff.; Luke 6: 6 ff.
[78] Matt. 12: 9 ff.; Luke 14: 1 ff.
[79] Mark 2: 27.
[80] Cf. Luke 6: 5.

has again healed a sick man and been accused by the Jews of breaking the Sabbath, brings the Sabbath commandment in direct parallel to the account of the creation,[81] and likewise in direct parallel with the controversy in contemporaneous Judaism: "My Father worketh until now, and I work." [82] The results of this controversy are depicted by the Evangelist. "For this cause, therefore, the Jews sought the more to put Him to death, because not only was He breaking the Sabbath, but also calling God His own Father, making Himself equal with God." [83] As a last instance of Jesus' attitude to the Sabbath, we may mention His words: "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." [84]

The right inward attitude is the decisive element in every action. This truth becomes even clearer as the discussions of Jesus with the Pharisees proceed. The same truth appears in His discussions about ceremonial precepts of the Law. To understand the following illustration, let us recall the painful care exercised by the Jews in avoiding everything unclean. When the Pharisees complain that the disciples of Jesus transgress the traditions of the fathers by not washing their hands when they eat, He announces before the assembled multitude the principles that should govern the questions of meat and drink. "There is nothing from without the man that entering into him can defile him; but the things which proceed out of man, these are they that defile man." When He was told that the Pharisees were scan-

[81] Gen. 2: 1 ff.
[82] John 5: 17.
[83] John 5: 18.
[84] Matt. 12: 8; Mark 2: 28; Luke 6: 5.

dalized at these words, He explained His view still more clearly. "Every plant that My heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be uprooted. . . . Do ye not see that whatsoever entereth the mouth passeth into the belly, and is cast out into the privy? But the things that come out of the mouth, come forth from the heart, and these defile a man." [85] The contrast between Jesus and the Pharisees, the insistence on the insignificance of all merely outward activity, could not be expressed more sharply and dramatically.

Jesus' teaching about the value of ceremonial prescriptions accords with His entire attitude toward the Law. His attitude to contemporary Pharisaism becomes clear only gradually. He did not purposely seek to oppose the Pharisees. This is made clear by His accurate knowledge of Pharisaical teaching and practice, by His method of interpreting Scripture, which agrees with theirs, by the conception that is common to Him and to them of the Law as an essential element of piety, and lastly by similar formulas regarding fundamental truths like the kingdom of God, justice, and others. What finally led to His opposition to the Pharisees was the fact that their life did not accord with their teaching: that they haughtily despised the common people, that their development of the Law through their tradition made men forget what was important, that they compelled the observance of men's commandments but neglected those of God.[86]

Therefore the more Jesus insisted on the proper

[85] Matt. 15: 1 ff.; Mark 7: 1 ff.
[86] Matt. 15: 3 ff.; Mark 7: 8 ff.

inward disposition as the very essence of piety, the more also His expressions became a condemnation of Pharisaical virtue. And the more these expressions touched on the province of the worship of God, the more emphatic they became since He saw that especially in these matters the people were led astray. That is the picture we gather from the sources. Hence Jesus' words on justice, prayer, fasting, and almsgiving, on the observance of the Sabbath, on the moral and ceremonial precepts of the Law, are mingled with His opposition to contemporary Pharisaism. Approaching our conclusion in this matter, we may remind the reader that the opposition between Jesus and the Pharisees was not understood in all its details even by our Lord's earliest followers. But what is clear we now proceed to summarize.

Jesus remains united with the world of religious thought prevalent among His people, remains united with all their expressions of liturgical life as long as their ideas do not contradict His own better insight and knowledge. He departs from them only when they are wrong. While, then, He shares with them the same fundamental attitude in regard to the things of God, nevertheless He does not hesitate, even in most important matters, to break with everything which we are accustomed today to style Pharisaical. And the reason is that He sets up as a standard, not the external observance of the Law, but the inward attitude of the soul, not ceremonial precepts, but His own Messiahship, not particular commands, but genuine love of God and neighbor. He judged all such matters, some-

times preserving, sometimes condemning, in accordance with His own divine knowledge. Hence we may say that His example rather than His word guided His disciples in their mode of judging the relations of the Old Testament piety and of contemporary ideas to their own new knowledge. Hence we may further understand how the separation from the old could not take place without a certain period of development, of opposition, even of contradiction. Hence, particularly if we consider the strength of conservatism which marks the liturgical element in every popular religion, we must face a special difficulty when we seek to find out how far the liturgical development of the young Christian Church was dependent upon contemporary Judaism.

CHAPTER V

JESUS' RELATION TO THE CHRISTIAN LITURGY

AS Jesus did not pray in order simply to influence His hearers, His inner life of prayer is a sanctuary which we cannot enter. We must regret that only the barest notices have remained of His life of prayer. On the other hand, the very brevity of these notices guarantees their genuineness. We see clearly herein that the disciples seldom heard words of the Master at prayer. Therefore the little that they do record is the more unquestionable. Most of what we know comes from St. Luke, who shows a delicate perception in what he tells us of the prayers of Jesus. The Evangelist gives us a particular incident from Jesus' last days (21: 37). According to this passage, Jesus spends the day in the Temple to teach and to heal. The night He spends on the Mount of Olives. Early in the morning He returns to the Temple to teach the people who came to the early morning sacrifice.

In this and similar passages we recognize clearly what were the inner sources that animated our Lord's outer activity. The early Christians remembered that He fled

from the noise of the day into the solitude of the night. They understood that His loving service of all who approached Him [1] derived its nourishment from His uninterrupted conversation with God His Father. His unbroken life in God is what leads Him to pray. He receives new nourishment in prayer. His prayer is not a task. His prayer is not the fulfilment of a legal prescription, but a spontaneous expression of His love for His heavenly Father.

The foundation and starting point of this inward life of prayer is His own special relation to God. It is the relation of a child to his father, to a father with whom he feels himself united in his whole being and life. All the prayers that have been preserved as spoken by Jesus begin with the invocation "Father." This is of the greatest importance for our understanding of His inner life of prayer. If we note that all forms of liturgy move within human expressions and, on the other hand, note that the name of God is simultaneously a creed and an act of worship and thus realize the important role played by the name of God in the liturgy, we then see how important is the form of the name of God on the lips of him who prays. Undoubtedly what is new in the prayers of Jesus is that He calls God His Father.

In the religion of the Jewish people the idea of God as a king who rules a great kingdom is pre-eminent. This is proved by the expression which occurs so often in the Synoptic Gospels, whereby the work of Jesus is called the kingdom of God, or as Matthew has it, the

[1] Matt. 20: 24 ff.; Mark 10: 42 ff.; Luke 22: 25 ff.

kingdom of heaven. Further we note that the apocryphal Jewish literature bears testimony on every page to the kingdom of Jahve. It is easy to understand that words like those of Ps. 144: 11, "They shall speak of the glory of Thy kingdom: they shall tell of Thy power," had a strong influence on the Jewish form of prayer. Similar expressions are found in all the pious literature of Judaism (Psalms 23, 28, 103; Deut. 3: 33; 4: 31; Wis. 10: 10; Is. 24: 23; cf. I Hen. 84: 2; 103: 1; Jub. of Abraham, 12: 19). All these prayers culminate in the wish expressed by the eleventh petition of the Shemone Esre, "Be king over us, Jahve."

The common Jewish invocation at prayer was, "Jahve our King." It is true that in the Old Testament the word "king" does not have the despotic implication which it ordinarily has on the lips of most Orientals. In the psalms we find it often associated with a more friendly atmosphere. For instance, psalm 22 gives us with inimitable confidence the picture of Jahve as a shepherd who will not allow His flock to suffer want, who leads them to green pasture, to waters where they may rest. Again, Ps. 26: 10 runs as follows: "My father and my mother have abandoned me, but Jahve receives me." Often, too, we find terms of expression in which the chosen people is called "son of God," and others which praise God as the father of individual pious persons, and finally others which, in addition to the relation of service, add that of childhood, as, for instance, in the prayer of Ecclesiasticus, 23: 1.

But, while all this is true, it is also true that the ordinary relation of the individual Israelite to God is not

that of a child to its father, but that of a servant to its master. For the first time the relation of the child to God finds exclusive expression in the prayers of Jesus; because Jesus is the Son, He prays to God His Father.

Israel's eyes, then, are turned to Jahve as the eyes of the servant to the hand of his master (Ps. 122: 2). The motive of this confidence is the thought that Jahve is the lord of hosts, that Jahve is the great, strong, and terrible God.[2] Jahve becomes Father of an individual only if that individual is in a special sense religious and faithful.[3] In Jesus' prayers, on the contrary, the thought of the majesty and sublimity of God in relation to man, the fundamental attitude of trembling reverence before that King who is above all understanding, retires into the background in favor of an emphatic expression of the loving nature of God, of His desire to enter into communion with the individual. God in this view is not attempting to build up an external kingdom with special selection of members, but an internal kingdom, a dwelling of the Father in which even the prodigal son retains his domestic rights and his name of son.[4]

We have here a God who shows special love to the praying child that feels itself to be unfaithful,[5] a father who knows the needs of His children long before they have been expressed to Him.[6] In the presence of such a Father the child does not need to make many words

[2] Deut. 10: 17; Neh. 1: 5; 9: 32; Dan. 9: 4.

[3] Lagrange, "La paternité de Dieu dans l'ancien Testament" in *Revue biblique*, V (1908), 482.

[4] Matt. 5: 44 ff.; Luke 15: 12–32.

[5] Luke 18: 10 ff.

[6] Matt. 6: 8.

like the heathen,[7] who multiply divine names and titles, full of anxiety lest they endanger the hearing of their prayer by omission or inversion of any of these names or titles.

It is true that Ecclesiasticus, 7: 15 (cf. Eccles. 5: 1) had exhorted the Jews to simplicity; "Be not full of words in the multitude of the ancients, and repeat not words in thy prayer." But Jesus never shows a multiplication of invocations, needing not in any way to circumscribe by many names the essence of God. His prayers are not intended primarily as a creed or doctrine, as is the Jewish Shema. "Father," he says. That is His prayer. All those who know God through Him are allowed to repeat this title. Only of His enemies among the Jews does He say that they do not know God.[8] His faithful disciples accept His word as true when they acknowledge that the kingdom of God does not come from observing the signs of time and place, but is within,[9] consists in a childlike spirit,[10] is not satisfied with a superficial "Lord, Lord," and "Yes, Yes," [11] but by deeds fulfils the will of the Father even there where that will is opposed to their own wishes.

From this childlike attitude toward God the Father, flow the unconditional promises which Jesus attached to prayer.[12] This truth is illustrated by certain parables: that of the friend at midnight, of the child asking its father for bread, of the widow importuning the

[7] Matt. 6: 7.
[8] John 7: 28.
[9] Luke 17: 20 f.
[10] Matt. 18: 3.
[11] Matt. 7: 21.
[12] Matt. 7: 7 ff.; Mark 11: 24; Luke 11: 9 ff.

judge.[13] These parables fill the heart of the listener with the same childlike confidence in the Father which they show in the heart of the Evangelist. Consequently they are also a revelation of the mysteries of Jesus' prayer. Let us note the contrast between this spirit of prayer in Jesus and its counterfeit in the Pharisees. The Pharisees with all their many words and their self-righteousness and pride [14] beg only for the national independence and greatness of Israel. Jesus, on the contrary, though knowing that childlike prayer obtains everything [15] and that a confident prayer may even remove mountains (Mark 11: 22–25; Luke 17: 6), still during His agony does not ask the Father to send Him legions of angels,[16] but rather subordinates natural human aversion in order to do the Father's will.[17]

The prayer of Jesus consists in the union of His will with that of God. It is His subordination to or rather identification with the saving will of God. Hence He can do nothing except in harmony with God's will. Here we see how the prayer of Jesus is the height of moral excellence and raises Him above the circumstances of environment. It shows His childlike attitude toward the loving Father who directs everything for the welfare of those who trust to His will and His ways.

Here likewise is the ultimate source of the certainty of being heard. Here, lastly, we see how far His childlike prayer rises above all Old Testament piety. The

[13] Luke 11: 5 ff., 11 ff.; 18: 1 ff.
[14] Luke 18: 11.
[15] Luke 11: 9 ff.
[16] Matt. 26: 53.
[17] Matt. 26: 39; Mark 14: 36; Luke 22: 42.

Old Testament piety could not let God rest in peace until He had poured out upon it the fulness of earthly blessing wherein it saw the sign of a special goodness and recognition of its own piety. Jesus, on the contrary, resigns Himself without reserve to the Father and trusts Himself to the Father's will. "Father, not as I will, but as Thou wilt."

For Jesus God was Father, His own heavenly Father,[18] and God was Father in such a unique way that Jesus never includes others with Himself in this relation with God. Rather we often find Him drawing a sharp line, on one side of which is God and Jesus, and on the other the disciples. Thus, for instance, we have Matt. 23: 8–10: "Be not you called 'Rabbi,' for one is your master, and all you are brethren. And call you father no man upon earth, for one only is your Father, who is in heaven. Neither be you called leaders, for one only is your leader, the Christ."

Nevertheless it is still true that God, the Father of Jesus, is likewise, though in another sense, the Father of the disciples and of all men. This truth stands out clearly in many passages of the Gospels, both in the Synoptic tradition and in the Johannine. We have words of doctrine, words of disputation, and parables that illustrate the name of God as Father, and show forth God's paternal goodness. How significant it is that the prayer which He taught His disciples begins with the words "Our Father"! Hence this prayer, though we must emphasize that it is the prayer He

[18] Matt. 7: 21; 10: 32; 12: 50; 15: 13; 16: 17; 18: 10; Mark 1: 11; 8: 38; 9: 6; 13: 32; 14: 36.

made for His own but not for Himself, is one of the best sources wherein to find Jesus' attitude toward prayer.

This is the view of even the earliest tradition we have in the matter. St. Luke tells us (11: 1) that the text of the Our Father was communicated by Jesus to His disciples on an occasion when the disciples saw their Master at prayer and thus desired to pray in similar fashion. The spirit, further, which breathes in these simple and deep words is likewise the spirit of love and confidence. The three petitions express what every child in communion with the Father finds necessary: the kingdom of God, daily bread, and forgiveness of sin. But the determination of the time for the coming of the kingdom is left to the Father. What under all circumstances is to be done, is God's will, the Father's will.

To show the contrast between the Old Testament and the New, let us take Jeremias' prayers, which are considered especially spiritual and spontaneous, and therefore similar to those of Christ. Jeremias has written down prayers which might be entitled "Thy kingdom come"; [19] but even the most spiritual prayers of Jeremias [20] contain very egotistic petitions.[21] And his complaint, "Thou hast deceived me, O Lord, and I am deceived," [22] begs for a kingdom, to be attained by the divine will, which brings to his people all external gifts

[19] Jer. 4: 10; 6: 11; 12: 1; 15: 15; 16: 1; 17: 12–28; 20: 7.
[20] Jer. 15: 10–21; 20: 7–18.
[21] Jer. 17: 18; 18: 20 ff.; 20: 12.
[22] Jer. 20: 7.

for fortune. Hence this man who lived in the memory of his people as a great man of prayer,[23] seeing the uselessness of even the most fervent petition against the will of God, ends with passive resignation.[24] Here we have no joyful, confidential acquiescence to the will of God. This contrast shows us that the petition "Father, Thy kingdom come," the fulfilment of God's will in heaven and on earth, and the joyful childlike resignation to God in all situations of life, were first born in the spirit of Christ and first became a reality in the Our Father.

But the spirit of the child which pervades the Our Father does not ignore the petition for material needs. It is natural to a child of God to ask for all that it needs, not in anxiety and in long repetitions, but with a simplicity which sets forth what is nearest and most desired. The child prays for these things even though it is aware that the Father already knows its needs.[25] The exclusively spiritual interpretation, of a later time, is not adequate. Jesus teaches His disciples to pray, just as the Old Testament does, for food in season.[26] Also on other occasions He teaches His disciples to pray for material gifts,[27] as He Himself prays for them.[28]

Just as we found in the Jewish table prayers a parallel to the petition for daily bread, so we find in Jewish piety a petition for forgiveness of sin. Not to mention

[23] II Mach. 15: 14.
[24] Jer. 7: 16; 13: 23; 15: 1 ff.; 17: 1 ff.
[25] Matt. 6: 25–34; Luke 12: 22–31.
[26] Ps. 103: 27; 144: 15; cf. I Cor. 10: 26.
[27] Mark 13: 18.
[28] Mark 7: 34.

the many prayers in the psalms, let us refer to certain passages in the Books of Kings,[29] in Esdras, Nehemias, and Daniel,[30] and the prayer of Manasses. But first of all we must notice that such prayers for forgiveness are relatively rare, since the pious Jew's notion of his own righteousness led him to external observances rather than to humble petition for God's mercy. Further we notice that there is lacking in these prayers the acknowledgment of guilt which we find in the Our Father. The Our Father contains this new element: aware of our sinfulness, we are to forgive our debtors that the Father may forgive us.

The difference between this spirit and even later prayers of Judaism is shown by the Shemone Esre. In this prayer we find no readiness to forgive; rather a cry of jubilation at the destruction of enemies, of blasphemers, and of rebels (12). What a contrast to this, when Jesus teaches us to pray: "Father, forgive us, as also we forgive." Jesus Himself, it is true, never has the consciousness of being in any way unworthy of the Father, since He always does what is pleasing to Him.[31] But the more we find Him urging His disciples to forgive one another,[32] the more we recognize how characteristic of His spirit is the command which the Our Father tradition contains. In this regard Matthew (6: 12) and Luke (11: 4) are of one accord, not only in recording the petition, but in assigning the remote oc-

[29] I Kings 7: 5; 15: 24 f.; II Kings 12: 13; 24: 10, 17.
[30] Esd. 9; Neh. 9; Dan. 9.
[31] John 8: 29.
[32] Matt. 18: 21–35.

casion and context.[33] We have a similar tradition recorded in Mark (11: 25).

Likewise the petition, "lead us not into temptation," that is, keep us from sin, has its parallel in another precept of Jesus.[34] Jesus' trust in the providence of His Father, in which He perseveres even in His hours of deepest agony,[35] is mirrored in this prayer of the disciples who with childlike confidence await the help of the Father in all circumstances, even in those which may contain a temptation to sin. They should not indulge in vain self-confidence; [36] but, in the knowledge that the flesh is weak, they watch and pray.[37] They have the most absolute confidence that the Father in heaven will deliver them and do not trouble themselves with the question of how He will do so.

The well-known trait of the Our Father, namely, mutual intercessory prayer, mirrors the way Jesus Himself prayed. What He here teaches His disciples is contained in His own prayers. He interceded for others, for friends [38] and for enemies.[39]

Thus the Our Father is the incomparable prayer of His disciples. It transfers His own filial attitude to all men. Men who by Jesus know God as their Father and who then pronounce the Our Father express in prayer only what is the inmost disposition of their heart. Con-

[33] Matt. 6: 14 f.; cf. 5: 23 ff.; Luke 6: 37.
[34] Luke 22: 40.
[35] Luke 22: 42 and parallels.
[36] Matt. 26: 33 ff.
[37] Matt. 26: 41.
[38] Luke 22: 31 f.
[39] Luke 23: 34.

sequently the Our Father becomes a guide for those who wish to understand Jesus' idea of prayer. The Our Father is His own expression of prayer in spirit and in truth, and can be summed up in the well-known three words: Father, Thy will, Thy kingdom.

In summary we may say that all Jesus' prayers, His doctrine of prayer, the parables He used to illustrate prayer, and finally the one prayer that He explicitly taught, all reveal His filial attitude toward God the Father. For Himself prayer is a conversation of the heart with the heavenly Father in spirit and in truth. His will is that the disciples pray in the same spirit.[40] If the prayer is in spirit and in truth, coming from the heart of a child that knows God for its teacher, the outward form is an indifferent matter.

We do not know the conditions of the Jewish liturgy in the time of Jesus thoroughly enough to enter into detailed investigation of its liturgical prayers. Could we do so, it would be important. We need but reflect that studies on the religion of Babylon and Egypt show "that even the most deeply felt hymns and prayers come at long last to serve only the purposes of conjuring." [41] But this much lies on the surface. The invocations that introduce Jewish prayers remind us of the Oriental relation of the slave to master and king. Hence we should not wonder that the liturgical prayer and the whole ceremonial and ritual system of the Jewish liturgy follow the customs which were developed in such splendor at the courts of Oriental kings. The

[40] John 4: 21 ff.
[41] Greiff, *Das Gebet im alten Testament*, 1915, p. 2.

close bond of union between the earthly king and the heavenly King, which characterized the entire Orient, is also a popular belief of Judaism. Hence we expect to find that the honors which the Jews gave to kings and nobles were copied in their relations to the King who is God. Liturgical precepts show close resemblance to court ceremonial. God is Israel's supreme King and Lord. Here we have the source of the solemn public liturgy of the Jews. From this viewpoint we understand the magnificence of the Temple structure, wherein stands the throne of the Most High. Into this inner sanctuary the common man dared not enter under pain of death. Within we have a select body of servants in strictly hierarchical order serving day and night the Lord of hosts, before whom they keep lights burning, to whom they offer precious incense, to whom the people bring their tithes, and the blood of sacrificial animals to acknowledge the Master of life and death.

In the place of this exclusive thought of the kingdom of God, Jesus substitutes faith in God's fatherhood. His prayer, being a conversation with the Father, can do without all those elements which had been created by one-sided emphasis on the royal power of God.

Here is the place to answer the question whether Jesus took part in the official Jewish prayer, that is, at the determined hours of prayer and in the liturgical place, namely, in the Temple or in the synagogue. The answer is, that He did. This answer harmonizes with His general attitude, which acknowledged traditional authority and avoided every kind of scandal as long as He found in the traditional forms the expression

of His own spirit. For this position we have clear statements.[42] We have, besides, many descriptions of Pharisaical abuses which He had observed in the synagogue.[43] Did Jesus, in taking part in liturgical prayer, wear the prescribed symbolic garments? The garments which at this time the Jews had adopted for prayer, both public and private, were the great tallith, a square cloth of wool or silk, fitted out with blue or white knots and tassels at the four corners. This garment was placed on the head and shoulders. We have also the tephillin, that is, strips of leather having little pockets of parchment. The tephillin were fastened to the head and the left arm. In the pockets there were little slips of parchment on which were inscribed some of the following passages: Ex. 13: 1–10, 11–16; Deut. 6: 4–9; 11: 13–21.

No reason can be assigned for supposing that Jesus departed from the universal custom. These garments were merely an external expression of Israel's memory that Jahve had always been the special protector of Israel. If, therefore, they belonged to the Israelitic style of garments, we may conclude that Jesus wore them. One Gospel passage seems to indicate that Jesus did wear them. Speaking of the woman who suffered from a flow of blood, the Evangelist says that she touched the hem of His garment.[44] The Greek word which we translate "hem" may here signify the tassels of the tallith. The passage sometimes quoted against this view [45] is really not against it. Jesus condemns not the use of

[42] Matt. 4: 23; Mark 1: 39; Luke 4: 16–30, 44; 13: 10; John 6: 59; 18: 20.
[43] Matt. 6: 2, 5; 23: 6; Mark 12: 39; Luke 11: 44; 20: 46.
[44] Luke 8: 44.
[45] Matt. 23: 5.

the phylacteries and fringes themselves, but the boastful hypocrisy of the Pharisees manifested in their custom of making their phylacteries very broad and their fringes very long. There is nothing in the passage to justify the view that Jesus was opposed to these outward signs themselves. What He always regarded was the inner disposition.

For His own prayers Jesus preferred remote and silent places to the liturgy in the Temple. What consequences followed this attitude of His we shall see later. But still the conclusion lies very near that the things we have been speaking of were indifferent in His eyes. If only the prayer of the child to the Father comes from the heart, it becomes a matter of indifference what kind of liturgical ritual it follows. The child knows that the value of his prayer does not depend upon certain rites, places, and times. The child follows the inward urge of his heart and prays to the Father when, where, and how he feels himself impelled to it. The very word of Jesus (Luke 18: 1) urges His disciples to pray always and everywhere. This word delivers prayer from its bondage to time and place and establishes a spiritual liturgy, which had in some degree indeed been anticipated by the synagogue but could not be brought to perfection because the synagogue was still bound to the Law.

One last word of Jesus remains to be considered in this connection (John 4: 21–24). Here Jesus explicitly affirms what was implicitly contained in His doctrine and attitude, namely, that the knowledge and veneration of God the Father are not limited to any particular place or any special ritual. The Samaritan woman says:

"Our fathers worshiped on this mountain.[46] But you [47] say that Jerusalem is the place where men must worship the Father. . . . But the hour cometh and now is, when true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth. For indeed the Father seeketh such worshipers. God is a spirit: and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth."

In these words we have the explicit affirmation that the spiritual nature of God is the foundation of a piety which is independent of all times, places, and customs. This divine nature demands a piety that wells up out of the deepest heart. The worship of God must be true, that is, must truly correspond to this spiritual nature. So far both Samaritans and Jews had failed to see this truth. Disputing with each other whether Mount Garizim or the Temple at Jerusalem was the right place for the genuine worship of God, they had ended by putting the spiritual God into bondage under corporeal limitations.

Even where the prophetic piety of the psalmist brings forth blossoms of the knowledge of God and takes on forms wherein the reprobation of the Temple service seems to be foreshadowed, the Old Testament fails to formulate the doctrine that God is a spirit and is to be worshiped in spirit. The solution of Jesus is in a higher order than the customs of the fathers and the traditional forms of the liturgy. What decides is here again the spirit and attitude. The fundamental truth is found in

[46] Garizim. Its sanctuary was then in ruins.
[47] Jews.

the relation of the child to God. In order to have a worship of God that is suitable to His essence, a worship in spirit and in truth, we must recognize that He is a spirit, but especially that He is the Father.

CHAPTER VI

JEWISH INFLUENCES AFFECTING THE PRIMITIVE LITURGY

LET us here consider a statement which we must later confirm. The statement is this: the present liturgy of the Christian Church cannot be explained historically without recurring to what it inherited from Judaism. Further, however rare are particular references in the New Testament to the dependence of Christian liturgy on Jewish liturgy, its general dependence cannot be expressed more sharply than it is in the New Testament writings. It is true that in every liturgy there is expression of what is common to all religions; and this truth suffices to explain many similarities between the Jewish divine service and the primitive Christian liturgy. But beyond this there are reasons which compel us to admit an immediate relation between the Jewish and the Christian forms of divine worship.

When we examine Jewish religious literature and especially their apocryphal and pseudoepigraphic literature, we find that Jewish piety and the concept of the liturgy based thereon had in New Testament times

reached a stage of development approaching that worship of God in spirit and in truth which we outlined in the foregoing chapter. The advantage of this situation was that converts from Judaism to Christianity could more easily understand the demand of Jesus to worship God in spirit and in truth. In particular the synagogue, as we have already pointed out, insisted on a more spiritual service of God without sacrifices, bloody or unbloody. At the same time we must not overlook the truth that the veneration of the legal and doctrinal sides of worship could become an obstacle to genuine development of religious intimacy. The danger existed, that the synagogue might become, instead of a place of prayer, rather a mere school for doctrine and wisdom. But on the whole we cannot deny that the synagogue by its spiritual conception of liturgy was more valuable to many Jews as a place of divine worship than was the Temple with its external sacrifices.

A second line of approach in Judaism was offered by the teaching of many of the prophets on sacrifice and liturgy. Their doctrine cannot be explained exclusively by their opposition to merely ceremonial service of God and liturgical aberrations. Their doctrine approaches often a condemnation of bloody sacrifice in general and of all that belongs to merely external worship of God. Let us listen, for example, to the following passage of Isaias (1: 11–15): "To what purpose do you offer Me the multitude of your victims, saith the Lord. I am full, I desire not holocausts of rams, and fat of fatlings, and blood of calves, and lambs, and buckroes. . . . My soul hateth your new moons, and your solemnities: they are

become troublesome to Me, I am weary of bearing them." [1] In Amos we read (5: 21–24): "I hate, and have rejected your festivities: and I will not receive the odor of your assemblies. And if you offer Me holocausts and your gifts, I will not receive them: neither will I regard the vows of your fat beeves. Take away from Me the tumult of thy songs: and I will not hear the canticles of thy harp. But judgment shall be revealed as water, and justice as a mighty torrent."

Passages like these might be interpreted in the sense that Jahve refuses only the sacrifices of "sinners." But there are many other passages which express the view that Jahve does not demand sacrifices and has never demanded them, that sacrifices are not necessary forms of true religion. These texts deny explicitly that sacrifice and ceremonial worship are essential exercises of religion.[2] We must keep such passages before our mind

[1] Translator's note. Proving too much proves nothing. Isaias, in the very text here cited, condemns prayer just as he condemns blood-sacrifices. The passage condemns, not prayer and not blood-sacrifice, but prayer and blood-sacrifice as divorced from social justice. In this sense I understand all similar passages in the prophets. Again, why do these oppressors of widows and orphans offer sacrifice at all? Evidently because they believe the Law demands such sacrifices. Can we conceive the prophets, jealous for the Law, undermining with one hand those precepts of the Law which were still observed and with the other hand rebuilding observance of precepts which were contemned? No, their sharp-edged language implies their approval of blood-sacrifices, but only on condition that these sacrifices be not dissociated from justice to their fellow men.

Again, our author elsewhere maintains that sacrifice is an essential trait of religion. If so, how can the prophets be supposed to frown on sacrifice? Sacrifice must be spiritual, yes. It must come from a spiritual heart. But what does the spiritual heart spiritualize? It spiritualizes the external sacrifice. See, e. g., *infra*, pp. 176 ff.

While we regret this unhistorical and undogmatic passage, we must also note that the passage is in no way essential to our author's argument. We disregard the momentary lapse and pass on.

[2] See the preceding note.

if we would not misunderstand New Testament texts. Amos, for example, proves Jahve's indifference to external worship by reminding the people that in the desert through those forty years Jahve did not demand sacrifices of animals or foods (*ibid.*, 2: 10; 5: 25). Micheas declares that Jahve asks of His people no sacrifice, but only: "to do what is good, to love mercy, and to walk solicitous with thy God." Again, Jeremias (7: 21–23): "Add your burnt offerings to your sacrifices, and eat ye the flesh. I spake not to your fathers, and I commanded them not, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning the matter of burnt offerings and sacrifices. But this thing I commanded them, saying: Hearken to My voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be My people: and walk ye in all the way that I have commanded you."

Besides these passages which refer directly to sacrifice, there are others in the prophets which emphasize the truth that spiritual relations with God form the essence of religion.[3] "Jahve's word" is in many passages from the prophets not merely a characteristic introductory formula, but rather expresses the most beautiful fruit of religious life, a special sign that Jahve is pleased with His people. When Jahve's word is withdrawn from His people, their hopes are crushed. Thus we find, for instance, in Amos a climax of the judgment on the northern kingdom in the expression that they will be hungry but not for bread, and will be thirsty but not for water, thirsty and hungry rather to hear the word of Jahve. We see them running from one end of the land

[3] See p. 98 note 1.

to the other, from one sea to the other, to look for Jahve's word, but without finding it. On that day the beautiful virgins and the young men will fall down senseless from thirst, the guilty people will fall without being able to rise again (8: 11–14). On the other hand, it is the people's highest happiness that Jahve Himself is their teacher, that He is so near to them with His word that their eyes can see Him always, that their cry can reach His ears. "This is the way, walk in it," comes Jahve's cry when they go aside to the right or to the left (Is. 30: 20–26). Again, in Jeremias, it is the sign of the new covenant that Jahve writes His law in the hearts of the whole people, when one needs no longer to instruct the other, saying: "Know Jahve." "For they will all know Me, from the smallest to the greatest" (31: 31–34).

The essence of the prophetic office is to announce Jahve's word to His people, to tell them, "Know Jahve." Hence this office will cease as soon as the whole people possesses Jahve by knowing Him. Then each member of the chosen people is full of the prophetic spirit and no longer needs the prophet (Joel 3: 1 f.). In the second part of Isaias this line of thought becomes so clear that the true people of Jahve becomes identified with the prophet of Jahve. "Hearken to Me, O My people, and give ear to Me, O My tribes. . . . I have put My words in thy mouth, and have protected thee in the shadow of My hand, that thou mightest plant the heavens and found the earth; and mightest say to Sion: Thou art My people" (Is. 51: 7, 16).

From this viewpoint we find that the ideal of the Old Testament is a divine covenant where all members of that people are prophets. Moses says: "Why hast thou emulation for me? O that all the people might prophesy, and that the Lord would give them His spirit" (Num. 11: 29). This is possible because prophecy in its essence is conceived, not as the foretelling of future events, but rather as a bond of union with Jahve. It is this spiritual union of the people with Jahve by the prophetic spirit, a spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel, of fortitude, of knowledge, and of fear of the Lord (Is. 2: 2) that casts such a different light on all external liturgical sacrifices, and that reveals itself as the Old Testament preparation for what, in the New Testament, is called worship of God in spirit and truth (John 4: 23).

Now this new conception passed over into the possession of the synagogue. We do not mean that the worshipers in the synagogue always grasped this truth in its religious depth and purity. But we do mean that they saw therein the essential freedom from the necessity of liturgical sacrifice and practices.[4] We mean further that they learned thence to emphasize the value of Jahve's word and of His law. Further, from the synagogue this conception passed over to the contemporaries of Jesus. The merit of the synagogue lies in the fact that, while it was not the creator of such a spirit, it was still the stream, the medium, by which the prophetic conception was preserved and passed on to wider cir-

[4] See p. 98 note 1.

cles since the prophets themselves appeared sporadically, and the schools of the prophets had quite another meaning and very restricted importance.

But when we come to analyze the relation between the prophetic conception and the synagogal conception of God and the liturgy, we must notice likewise a number of contrasts. First of all, nowhere in the Old Testament do we find the explicit phrase, "God is a spirit." Further, wherever there is mention of the spirit of Jahve, we find that this spirit rests not on the individual Israelite, but on the prophet as God's especially chosen mouthpiece of revelation. Rather the Old Testament speaks of a special sign of grace that belongs to the New Testament when the spirit of God will rest on each and every one of the faithful.

Further, we find that Jesus removes another obstacle to the worship of God by teaching that the individual rather than the whole people is the religious unit. Hence the synagogal service of God, by emphasizing the people as the unit, shows its dependence on piety and liturgy as practiced in the Temple. Again, the synagogal service is national rather than personal and consequently needs official approval. Hence the synagogue was not able to dispense with the many ceremonial precepts, with the daily washings, and purifications, with unprescribed private sacrifices and external observance of the Sabbath. Rather we find that the synagogue laid stress on observance of the law, external justification, in contrast with inner purity of heart.

Here is the place to refer to an older view which holds that the synagogue did not regard its services as sacrificial

but still considered religious sacrifices as limited to the Temple. What we have so far said and the general results of recent investigations show that this older view is exaggerated. We must now admit that the synagogue, particularly in the Diaspora and at a distance from Jerusalem, had its own proper significance as an exercise of liturgical worship though not sacrificial.

But one element of that old view is correct and must not be overlooked. The impossibility of assisting at Temple worship, either by reason of exile or distance, originally brought the synagogue into existence and thus prepared the way for a more spiritual worship. Hence we find that the worshipers in the synagogue also took part in the sacrificial cult of the Temple. As a consequence the Temple, which continued in its ancient majesty and splendor even after the founding of the synagogues, had still a very wide influence on the masses. Thus the Temple became an obstacle to the development of unsacrificial synagogal cult, since at that very time the worship in the Temple had degenerated into externalism. Nevertheless the Temple retained its deep influence on most of the people.

We must remember that the majority of the early Christians belonged to the common people. Hence a priori we may expect that they retained strong affection for the Temple. Hence we may also expect that, although it was an age of synagogues, pious Israelites retained numerous connections with the Temple and consequently with sacrifice and ceremony. The early Christians, too, retained much of the Temple piety and liturgy in their own forms of worship. Possibly also they

were not sufficiently mindful of Jesus' teaching about the spiritual nature of worship.[5] This position becomes still more probable if we recall the historical situation that led Christianity to its final separation from Judaism. We must not imagine that this separation was owing exclusively to a new knowledge, to an awakening consciousness of their own radical difference from Judaism. The real reason, besides external persecutions noted in the stories of St. Stephen and St. Paul, was the destruction of the Temple and of the Jews as a nation in their conflict with the Romans.

If we read the Acts of the Apostles and the New Testament epistles, we find that the first Christians were far less separated from the Temple than was seemingly the Baptist with his disciples or the Essenes.[6] And the position of the Baptist,[7] and possibly that of the Essenes, who stood so high in the estimation of the Jews, show that even notable separation from the Temple did not at all have the meaning of a separation from Judaism. And this reference at a time when the influence of the Temple was still so pronounced is not superfluous. Further, we cannot affirm that the Essenes, in spite of their separation from the Temple, were distinguished by a more spiritual worship. They were excessively given to ceremonial washings and special rites. Moreover, they gave to their common meal an importance that raised their dining hall to a level with the Temple. Although condemning the Temple sacrifices, they offered consecrated

[5] See p. 98 note 1.

[6] Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, §§ 12 f.; Josephus, *Jewish Wars*, II, 8; *Antiquities*, XIII, v, 9; XV, x, 5; XVIII, i, 5.

[7] Matt. 3: 1–8; Mark 1: 5; Luke 3: 1 ff.

gifts to the Temple. Here we have a new proof that early Christianity was not necessarily opposed to sacrifices and other liturgical ceremonies. We must now turn to a deeper study of the historic sources. But before we proceed to the details of this investigation, let us meet an objection which says that the study of contemporary Judaism tells us nothing about the liturgical ideas of primitive Christianity.

The answer lies in this, that in the primitive Jewish-Christian Church we find no trace of antagonism between Christian customs and Jewish customs. This situation is intelligible only on the supposition that the community arising from Judaism regarded Christianity as the fulfilment of the Law. And the preaching of Jesus Himself, as recorded in the Gospels, does not at all exclude an obligation of remaining within Jewish conceptions. Hence there was the possibility that the primitive Christian community might, in forming its liturgy, be dependent on Judaism. The more predominance we find on the part of the Jewish-Christian element, the more inclination there would be (cf. Matt. 5: 17–19) to see in Jesus the rabbi who insisted that His disciples be faithful to the Jewish Law and the Jewish ceremonial. And that many Jewish Christians did, in fact, so look upon Him is evident in the disputes that arose at the time of the Apostles regarding the obligation of the Law. Even today scientific investigation shows that, although Jesus maintains in principle that the kingdom of God was open also to the pagans, still He confines His ministry almost exclusively to the people of Israel. Hence the Jewish Christians, clinging to their tradi-

tional faith and traditional liturgy, considered Jesus merely the fulfiller of the Mosaic legal and liturgical prescriptions.

Even if we hold that Jesus looked upon existing external sacrifices as secondary, as subordinate to worship in spirit, we must still maintain that the Jewish conception and formation of the liturgy exercised a strong influence on early Christianity. For the fact that Jesus commanded nothing in particular regarding worship and its development but always emphasized the inwardness and spirituality of worship, makes it clear that for others who followed Him the road was open to accept already existing liturgical forms if only these forms were the natural expression of their own inward disposition. On this ground we see how it was possible for early Christianity to take over Jewish customs and conceptions and likewise liturgical traditions. This is the more intelligible when we see how in its early period, even when it appeared under non-Jewish Christian forms, it still considered itself the legitimate continuation and confirmation of Judaism, still considered itself the genuine Israel and accepted the history of Israel as its own prehistory. Let us notice two sentences from two modern investigators. Duchesne, in his *Christian Worship*, speaks as follows: "The Christian Church arose out of Judaism." [8] Wendland, in his *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, uses these words: "Christian worship grew out of Jewish worship." [9] Even if we had no other contem-

[8] Thus Duchesne begins his *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution.*
[9] Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, 1912, p. 225; cf. p. 241.

porary Jewish and Christian writings, these two sentences can be supported by New Testament sources alone. Let us note the following passages.

First of all, the preaching of the Gospel in the beginning was directed exclusively to the Jews. The first communities were formed in Jerusalem and Judea,[10] in Galilee, Samaria, and the neighboring seacoasts.[11] We cannot conceive that these communities had no relation to the existing centers of worship, Temple or synagogue. And we find Paul in his missionary journeys always beginning with the synagogues and their Sabbath service in order to win his countrymen. Thus he acted in Damascus,[12] in Antioch,[13] in Iconium,[14] in Philippi.[15] We are told explicitly that in Thessalonica on three Sabbath days he preached in the synagogues.[16] He did likewise in Beroea,[17] in Athens,[18] every Sabbath in Corinth,[19] in Ephesus, both at his first visit [20] and later for a period of three months.[21] Let us note further the phrase in the Acts of the Apostles, which says that Paul always went first to the synagogues. To explain this situation it is not enough to refer to the practical need for a suitable place for instruction. Rather we see here again

10 Gal. 1: 22; I Thess. 2: 14.
11 Acts 1: 8; 8: 9; 13: 13 f.; 15: 3.
12 Acts 9: 20.
13 Acts 13: 14.
14 Acts 14: 1.
15 Acts 16: 13.
16 Acts 17: 2.
17 Acts 17: 10.
18 Acts 17: 17.
19 Acts 18: 4.
20 Acts 18: 19.
21 Acts 19: 8.

that the early Christians were zealous in observing the Law,[22] and for a long time remained faithful to the Temple. And how completely they felt themselves Jews, is evident from the example of Paul, the greatest adversary of the Law. In many aspects of his theology and in many of his personal sentiments and judgments, he remains dependent on the life he passed under the Law.

Let us further notice the Christians' recognition of the jurisdiction of the Jewish courts.[23] They do not claim exemption.[24] Hence we must conclude that they still thought of themselves as Jews. If they maintained this attitude even when Judaism placed obstacles in their way (I Thess. 2: 14), then we must grant a fortiori that they continued their exercises of piety in Temple and synagogue, that they still saw in Temple and synagogue the proper place of divine worship.

These general considerations are supported by particular instances. One of the most interesting of these is the attitude of the early Christians to fasting. Fasting was one of the three good works especially esteemed by Judaism, the other two being prayer and almsgiving. The classic description of the Jewish conception of fasting is that of the Pharisee in St. Luke (18: 11 f.). In Matthew (6: 16–18) Jesus condemns the Pharisees, who fast that they may be seen by men. When anyone fasts, says Jesus, he should not put on a sad and sour face, but rather as on days of joy anoint his head and wash his face so that men may not observe that he is doing

[22] Acts 21: 20.
[23] Matt. 10: 17; 23: 34; Acts 4: 1–22; 5: 17–42.
[24] Cf. Acts 4: 19, 29; 5: 29; 7: 1.

something penitential. Rather he should expect acknowledgment of his good work only from the Father, who sees what is secret.

Further we find that Jesus justifies His disciples for not fasting, although the disciples of John and the Pharisees (Matt. 11: 19) did fast. This fact is significant when we remember that the pious Jews fasted twice in the week, and that John the Baptist "came neither eating nor drinking." [25] Jesus Himself gives a reason for this attitude of His when He replies to His adversaries, saying: "Can the children of the bridegroom mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?" [26] Fasting is a sign of sadness, but the Messianic time is the climax of joy. But Jesus' disciples, after His ascension, did practice fasting, following the Savior's words.[27] Other passages also show the followers of Christ resuming their former Jewish practice of fasting.[28]

The acceptance of the Temple as the dwelling of God and place of public worship, which is expressed in many passages of the New Testament,[29] is in accord with Jewish ideas and traditions. The early Christians' custom of gathering for worship in private houses was not contrary to Jewish practice. In Judaism a connection existed between public and private worship. We need but recall how the Jewish father performed ritual actions when he was at table with his family. Tradition plays

[25] Matt. 11: 18.
[26] Mark 2: 19.
[27] Mark 2: 20.
[28] "In those days they shall fast"; Mark 2: 20; Matt. 17: 20; Mark 9: 28; Acts 13: 2, 3; 14: 22; cf. *Didache,* chap. 8.
[29] Acts 2: 46; 3: 1; 5: 12, 42.

an important part in liturgical customs. We may observe that even modern Judaism keeps the relation between house and synagogue. Hence we may conclude that even in New Testament times, besides the eating of the paschal lamb and the breaking of bread, many other religious rites could be observed in a Jewish home rather than in the Temple or in the synagogue. These domestic acts of worship, which we find in the primitive Christian Church, may well have been an inheritance from the Jewish liturgy.

Further, the Jewish synagogues, which are often called "places of prayer," "houses of prayer," were the birthplaces of public worship, while outside of Judaism we find only faint traces of "places of prayer." Finally, from the synagogue came the Christian liturgical practice of reading and interpreting the Scripture.

Likewise some of the Christian feasts came from Jewish sources. We need only note the strictness with which the Christians observed the law of the Sabbath.[30] It will not then surprise us that they observed also certain Jewish feast days.[31] So, too, they observed the traditional hours of prayer.[32] Lastly, they observed the traditional place of prayer, namely, the upper room.[33]

Let us now notice a number of instances which show the close interrelations between Jewish and primitive Christian worship. First, the dispute between Peter and Paul in Antioch.[34] We see here the Jewish aversion to

[30] Matt. 24: 20.
[31] Acts 2: 1.
[32] Acts 2: 15; 3: 1; 10: 10.
[33] Acts 10: 9; cf. Jer. 19: 13; Dan. 6: 10; Tob. 3: 10 f.
[34] Gal. 2: 11 ff.; cf. Acts 10: 14.

eating with non-Jews. We note further the general anxiety to observe the Jewish laws about food. Then the advice of James and of the elders, urging Paul to share in the Jewish acts of purification,[35] together with Paul's exact fulfilment of the Nazarite vow.[36] All these were elements of Jewish worship which early Christianity preserved and only little by little and with much difficulty abandoned. Let us but recall the discussion in Acts 16: 3 and Gal. 2: 3. All these details, as likewise the long strife of Paul with Jews and Jewish Christians, show how close was the connection between the Jewish liturgy and the primitive Christian liturgy.

We will notice in detail just one instance of the widespread Jewish influence on Christian liturgy. We refer to the description, given by St. Luke in the beginning of his Gospel, of the care with which liturgical functions were carried out by Zachary. "It came to pass, while he was performing his duties before God, in the order of his class, according to the custom of the priesthood, it fell to his lot to enter the sanctuary of the Lord and burn incense. And all the multitude of the people were praying outside at the hour of incense." [37] Luke had already noted that Zachary was a priest of the class of Abia, and that his wife was of the priestly race of Aaron (1: 5). They are commended with special praise as walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord without blame (1: 6).

Similar praise is given to the prophetess Anna, "who

[35] Acts 21: 18 ff.
[36] Acts 21: 23.
[37] Luke 1: 8 ff.

did not depart from the Temple but served God in fasting and prayer night and day." [38] Shortly before this we have the narration which tells how the parents of the Child Jesus performed all the prescriptions of the Law. He is carried to the Temple, "as it is written in the Law of the Lord" (2: 23); a sacrifice is offered "according to what is commanded in the Law of the Lord," the parents "do with Him according to the commandment of the Lord," He returns with them to Nazareth. Thereafter, from the age of twelve, He goes with His parents yearly to take part in the feast of the Pasch in Jerusalem according to the custom (2: 41 f.).

The writer of these passages seems to take for granted the legitimacy of the Temple and its liturgy. The entire tone of the narrative indicates that the piety of Luke and his contemporaries still finds its starting point and its norm in the Temple worship. Let us note particular elements included in the narrative. We have Anna the model widow; [39] we have the priest as heir of the prophetic spirit; we have the question which Jesus addressed to His parents: "Did you not know that I must be about My Father's business?" Finally, we note that the parents of Jesus, as also Zachary and Elizabeth, Simeon and Anna, are regarded as just and pious because they faithfully observed the liturgical prescriptions. All these details must be considered if we would judge rightly of the influence of contemporary Jewish liturgy on the formation of primitive Christian worship.

[38] Luke 2: 37.
[39] Cf. I Tim. 5: 5 f.

What remains for us here is to note summarily certain Jewish practices, paralleled in early Christianity. (1) The Jewish custom of table prayers and the like practice among the first Christians. (2) The singing of psalms and hymns. (3) The paschal supper among the Jews, the Lord's Supper among the Christians. (4) Memories of the manna compared with the bread of life.[40] (5) The symbolism of water,[41] of light,[42] and of the chalice of benediction.[43] (6) The Jewish method of caring for the poor contrasted with the selection of the seven deacons. (7) Priests contrasted with elders. (8) Certain standard formulas for liturgical prayers (e. g., Amen, Alleluia, and the doxologies). (9) The blessing of the priest. (10) The exclusion of women from the liturgical ministry. Not all of these can be put down as specifically Jewish. Many of them are common to all Oriental religions. Many of them are to be found in Hellenism, but these practices generally came to early Christianity through its connection with Judaism. "Of this there can be no doubt: before Paul, invited thereto by Barnabas, transferred the scene of his activity from Tarsus to Antioch, whence he set out upon his first missionary journey, Christianity had almost an exclusively Jewish form. The Jew became and remained a Christian in order to be thereby a more perfect Jew. That was the conception prevalent in wide circles." [44]

Let us conclude with two general reflections. Wher-

[40] John, chap. 6.
[41] John 7: 37 f.
[42] John 8: 12.
[43] I Cor. 10: 1 ff.
[44] Steinmann, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, VI (1908), 31.

ever we find in primitive Christianity elements cognate with Judaism, they are to be assigned, unless specifically and explicitly Christian, to Jewish influence. Secondly, Jewish influence is to be assumed where all other explanations leave us unsatisfied.

CHAPTER VII

PAGAN INFLUENCES

WE have no evidence which indicates direct influence of pagan liturgical usages on the primitive liturgical worship of Christians. Any influences that we find came to Christianity through Judaism.

The later Judaism made strong efforts to develop from a national religion into a universal religion. It did not indeed succeed in this attempt. Christianity was destined to fulfil what Judaism had but begun. Yet the very fact that Judaism did begin and thus aided Christianity to find its way into the great world, was of the utmost importance for the inner and outward development of Christianity itself. Let us, to illustrate, compare the propagation of Mithraism with the propagation of Christianity. Mithraism was propagated principally by political and social factors. The spread of Christianity, on the contrary, was brought about through the individual zeal of its missioners. And we note that a contributing factor in the success of these missioners was their habit of going to those territories where the Jewish Diaspora had exercised its influence upon its Hellenistic environment.

The tendency to universalism on the part of Judaism was not crowned with success. The reasons for this lack of success were partly internal, partly external. And under external difficulties we must mention especially the attitude of official Judaism particularly at the time of the Machabean insurrection. But although the effort was not successful, it had a great influence on contemporary Hellenism. Notwithstanding the contempt of the cultured Hellenistic world for the Jewish people, Hellenism was more and more influenced by Judaism while in turn Judaism itself was permanently influenced by Hellenism. We might refer briefly to the well-known translation of the Old Testament into Greek. Its first purpose, indeed, was to satisfy the needs of the Jew himself who no longer understood Hebrew. But a second reason was the proud feeling of the Jew in giving to the Hellenistic world of culture a book second to none in the world. We must further refer to the Jew's attempt to gain testimony from Greek poets and philosophers for his own Jewish faith, attempts which resulted in numerous Greek anthologies. This attempt, resulting from a high esteem for Greek wisdom, did in the long run come to have a great influence on the formation of the Jewish liturgy.

The first result of this contact was a Judaeo-Hellenistic literature. In this literature we see that Judaism, however sharply separated by its Pharisaical nature from the rest of the world, nevertheless must allow great influence to the predominant Grecian spirit. This influence soon reached to the inmost sanctuary of the liturgy. First of all, the language of divine service becomes in

the Jewish Diaspora Greek. Hebrew remains obligatory only for certain definite passages of Scripture and for the priestly blessing. Further, since the greater number of the Jews learned to know Holy Scripture only through the divine service, they now learned these truths in the Greek tongue. One author [1] goes so far as to maintain that even the Apostle Paul knew the Hebrew Bible only in its Greek translation. Further, nearly all the Old Testament citations in the New Testament writings are either taken from the Greek translation or at least are more closely related to the Greek text than to the original Hebrew. The Jew, indeed, was proud "to understand God's will, to approve the things that are more excellent, to be a guide to the blind, a light to those in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of the simple." [2] But he could not exercise this influence except in a strange language. This situation had two consequences. First, his mastery of Greek enabled him to propagate Jewish ideas in a world that was then much in love with Oriental cults. The second result was that the Jew himself, even in his conception of divine worship, was influenced by Greek thought. How far this influence reached is shown by the fact that later the Greek tongue was explicitly forbidden. It must be admitted, though, that this prohibition was not effective.

Yet Judaism resisted the influence of Greece much more strongly than did other Oriental religions. The Jewish liturgy here served as a bulwark. The monothe-

1 Kautzsch, *De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo apostolo allegatis*, 1869.
2 Rom. 2: 18 ff.

ism of the Jew, which forbade images, and his strict observance of the Sabbath, were strong supports in this resistance. Hence we find that Hellenistic influence was much more prominent in the synagogal service, with its insistence on doctrine, than in the case of the liturgy. The philosophic penetration of the Jewish Credo emphasizes the purely spiritual nature of divine service. But even this quality was not a direct result of Hellenistic environment. It may well have been but a step further in the natural development of synagogal worship after its separation from the Temple. We find, for instance, that already Theophrastus and Clearchus, disciples of Aristotle, as well as other cultured pagans,[3] had strong words of approval for the synagogal worship of the Jews.

Yet we must notice that Judaism did not consciously borrow any liturgical elements from paganism. We may illustrate this attitude by the passage in Rom. 9: 4, where St. Paul, at a time when he had definitely separated from the Law and circumcision, still praises his brethren who not only have the adoptive sonship and the glory and the covenant and the legislation, but above all the liturgy. No passage shows more clearly how St. Paul retained his Jewish views throughout his life. The Jews' privilege of being in possession of the true liturgy is an expression of the Jewish national consciousness. From this passage alone we can see the universal conception: strange liturgies have nothing to offer to the Jews.

In the Fourth Gospel also we find this same concep-

[3] Schürer, III, 156.

tion reflected. Jesus says to the Samaritan woman: "We (Jews) worship what we know; you worship what you know not." [4] Let us note that this sentence refers to the right kind of divine worship. The passage reflects the common conception of the Jews, that outsiders had no right to influence Jewish worship since these outsiders lacked the most fundamental qualification for genuine liturgy, since they did not have the right knowledge of God. And the Jew makes no difference between Samaritans and pagans. What is said in John 4: 22 holds good of both.

But if Judaism did not consciously borrow from Hellenism, we must admit that it did borrow unconsciously. Judaism, in spite of its self-sufficiency, was not able in the long run, particularly in its synagogal service, to resist all inroads of Hellenism and syncretism.

In two ways, then, strange elements entered into Jewish liturgy. First, by way of the general Oriental syncretism. Secondly, by Jewish Alexandrian philosophy. Here we must notice first of all that the particular kind of Hellenism which influenced Judaism was itself already affected with Oriental syncretism. Hence we may say that later Judaism was in itself a kind of syncretistic religion. And its elements are borrowed, not merely from Hellenism, but also from Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, and Egypt. The prophets had to combat the influences that came from strange religions. A scholar who knows well the historical conditions [5] speaks as follows: "Pure Jahvism was, up to the time of the exile, a kind

[4] John 4: 22.
[5] Hehn, *Die biblische u. babylonische Gottesidee*, 1913, pp. 366 f.

of esoteric religion, proper to the prophetic circle. The people professed Jahvism only externally. The more surprising it is then to find the stern self-consistency with which Jahvism, in spite of the inconquerable tendencies of the people, remained conscious of its own characteristic traits, and was able to maintain itself against the syncretism of the popular religion."

After the exile, Jahvism found it easier for a while to maintain itself both in doctrine and in liturgy. But the gradually growing synagogal service and the influence of the Diaspora made it again easier for Hellenism to influence Judaism. How far this influence went we cannot say. All that scholars have been able to find is that the influence was directly on the Jewish dogma (angelology, demonology, eschatology, apocalyptic doctrine). This much granted, we must likewise grant that liturgy in the proper sense was also, though indirectly, brought under Hellenistic influence. We have no occasion here to enter further into details of this development.

The second road of influence, namely, Jewish Alexandrian philosophy, is easier to follow. We must note first of all that philosophy in the proper sense of the word is not easily to be found among the Jews before Philo. Philo was the first who brought Greek philosophy and the Old Testament to a unity. Further, Philo's insistence on the importance of preaching [6] gave to his synagogal teaching a great influence on the formation and conception of the later Jewish liturgy. In his writings, based to a great extent on his preaching in the

[6] Philo, *The Life of Moses,* III, xxvii.

synagogue, he maintains that he has in no way departed from Judaism. The Holy Scripture is for him the source of all wisdom. Hence the question remains open whether his transformations of Jewish ideas on sacrifice and worship are to be considered a consequence of Hellenistic influence, or whether they are a mere attempt to give new life to the worship which the Jews inherited from their fathers.

Now, in spite of Philo's assurance, we must maintain that the final consequence of his symbolic interpretation of the Law is the reprobation of all ritual religion. His views of divine worship and spiritual sacrifice can only with difficulty be called Jewish. Rather they are the result of common contemporary conceptions that came into being in that religious and philosophical development which is best known as Judaeo-Hellenistic syncretism. This is the situation into which Christianity now enters. By its doctrine of reasonable sacrifice, it becomes the heir not only of Palestinian Judaism, but also of that Jewish Hellenism cultivated by Philo and the synagogues of the Diaspora. Christianity, more aware of its religious universality, finally freed men from all those limits within which Judaism remained bound.

So much for pagan influences mediated by Judaism. Is there any source which, independent of Judaism, may have influenced primitive Christianity? Only one source comes into question, namely, Graeco-Roman religion, more specifically the Graeco-Roman mysteries. When Christianity finally separated from Judaism and entered into the Hellenistic world, it entered simultaneously into an atmosphere saturated with mystery.

The influence of that world and its mysteries became ever stronger in the degree in which Hellenistic Christianity, notwithstanding all opposition on the part of the Jews, maintained its right to look upon its members as Christians in the fullest sense even without circumcision, synagogue, and Law. And this situation began even before the Romans put an end to the political independence of the Jews by destroying the center of their worship and liturgy. A leader in this movement was St. Paul.

Perhaps the opposition between Judaism and Christianity was not as sharp as some theologians have maintained. But no student will deny that a certain definite development of this opposition may be found even in the very bosom of the primitive Church. Both the Acts of the Apostles and the letters of St. Paul show that a strong Hellenistic element gradually overcame the one-sided Judaistic viewpoint. Sensible evidence of this situation of an internal evolution toward universalism is furnished by the appointment of the deacons in the government of the community.[7] This instance alone shows how Hellenism, either with or against the Diaspora, began to influence Christianity, at that time little emancipated from Judaism. From this time on, the two elements developed each in its own way. The Judaistic element, running parallel to the later development of Judaism in its external and internal political difficulties, lost its power more and more by uselessly retaining traditions that were already antiquated. The Hellenistic, on the contrary, opened to young Christianity the

[7] Acts 6: 1 ff.

door of the world. Responsible for this change was the Greek universalist mode of thought, which energetically drove the national Jewish particularist views out of the Christian camp. And in this situation the Hellenistic inclination to the mystery religions was of the greatest service to the development of Christian doctrine. This situation had important consequences for Christian worship and liturgy.

First of all, let us clarify the meaning of the term "Hellenistic Christians." The concept is not clear-cut. Likewise Judaism cannot be accepted as a univocal term, but rather as syncretistic. Besides these two extreme groups of Christians, the Christian community contained a common type. This type would naturally develop a form of worship under the influence of their former fondness for the mysteries. If, then, we must distinguish, in early Christianity, the Jewish Christians from the Gentile Christians, then in this latter class we shall find the sources of historical development which were independent of Judaism, even often opposed to Judaism. We must look to the Gentile Christians for those expressions and forms of public Christian life and worship which with their aid finally prevailed. Within the ranks of Gentile Christians, therefore, we expect to find the development of the Christian rite of initiation, namely, of baptism, in contrast to circumcision, or of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, or the practice of domestic celebrations of the mysteries in place of the synagogal worship.

Even starting from the New Testament writings alone we can follow this line of development though it

cannot be traced clearly without referring to other contemporaries. Here we must be content with a simple example. In the Odes of Solomon (10–6) we read as follows: "And the heathen who were dispersed had been all gathered together, and in my love I was not made unclean by their sacrificing on the high places." Seemingly we have here a passage of a Christian interpolator in the first Christian century.[8] The writer seems to have been deeply influenced by the missionary deeds of St. Paul. He seems to write at a time when surprise was felt that Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians were treated in the same way. We note how openly he speaks of a worship on the high places. With this excursus into non-biblical writings we must here be content.

Careful investigation is required to show in detail from the New Testament writings how far Hellenistic elements penetrated into Christianity. Since the views of scholars are so contradictory, we must beware of precipitate conclusions and proceed to investigate very carefully all the relevant texts.

The first example that we note is the eating of flesh offered to idols.[9] The example serves well to show how certain customs on the part of early Christians had definite influence on the formation of Christian life and worship. Let us first consider the background of the controversy.

Some members of the Corinthian Church had a certain weakness. Although in principle they acknowledged that idols were nothing, they still believed that

[8] Grimme, *Die Oden Solomos,* 1911.
[9] I Cor. 8: 1 ff.; 10: 23 ff.

to eat the flesh offered to these idols meant entering into living union with the god to whom the flesh was offered. Thus they found themselves in a quandary. Such flesh offered to idols was very common in Corinth. The markets often lay in the neighborhood of pagan places of worship. The pagan priests handed over for public sale the flesh that had been offered to the gods. These weak Christians refused to buy this meat. But they are scandalized when they see fellow Christians of stronger conscience, without scruple buying and eating this meat.

Various circumstances may have made this case of conscience frequent. First of all, the greater number of the converts were poor and had to procure their meat where they could. Then there must often have been reasons of relationship or friendship or of membership in certain corporations. Such occasions might lead them to go to pagan places at the invitation of relatives or companions. Thirdly, their social standing may often have led them to be invited to pagan houses where sacrificial meat was put before them,[10] and libations offered. The two letters to the Corinthians reveal a situation in which Christians, without thought of evil and with consciousness of their own freedom, went to the sacrificial banquets in pagan houses and temples. There at their entrance they would be sprinkled with a green branch by the pagan priest, there they would put wreaths on their heads and enter into the festal joy.

What interests us here is not St. Paul's admirable tact in solving the question. Here as in Rom. 14: 15 he does two things. First, he defends in principle the freedom

[10] I Cor. 10: 27.

of Christians in regard to eating and drinking. Secondly, he tells them they are still bound by consideration for the weakness of their brethren. This example shows how easily pagan syncretistic ideas could persist among Gentile Christians and thus influence the Christian liturgy. In the present case, the principle involved was made explicit by St. Paul himself.[11] The principle is this: liturgical banquets bring about a mystical union between the god and his worshipers. Consequently there can be no doubt that from the viewpoint of the history of religion the syncretistic idea that one participated in the divinity by eating the sacrificial banquet is of great significance in judging the import of the sacred banquet in primitive Christian liturgy.[12]

It is admitted that the Hellenization of Judaism was advanced by translating Hebrew literature and liturgy into the world language of Greece. So must it likewise be admitted that the contemporary Greek idiom was the medium by which Hellenistic culture entered into Christianity. But what we must notice more particularly is that the effects of this contemporary idiom on Christianity was still stronger than had been the influence on Judaism. The reason is this: Christianity depended much more than Judaism on the living word, on the daily contacts of life, and in particular on its liturgy.

We may even admit that the influence of popular Hellenism on early Christianity was more pronounced and extended than the canonical sources at our com-

11 I Cor. 10: 21; II Cor. 6: 15 f.

12 Thaddäus Soiron, O.F.M., writing in the *Theologische Revue* (1938, V, 177 f.), cites this passage as illustration of Nielen's tendency to use analogy as proof of dependence (Tr.).

mand today enable us to see. The reason is that at the time when New Testament literature was in course of writing many elements of Hellenism had already passed into the possession of Christianity, particularly by the way of common liturgical life. If we consider the New Testament writings merely as literature, we cannot overlook the Hellenistic influences. And not without reason do some scholars attempt to show the correspondence between the New Testament phraseology and the world of thought which prevailed in Graeco-Roman religion and philosophy.

The Cynics' teaching on the spiritual aspect of religion, on resignation to the divine will as the best kind of prayer, on purity of heart as the real sacrifice, emancipated men's minds gradually from anthropomorphic ideas of God. Christian preaching here found a point of contact. St. Paul above all others here goes his own way. We have but to read his defense of his own missionary methods among the pagans.[13] But St. Paul also manifests his power of profiting by ideas already living in the minds of his hearers. His speech in the Areopagus is a clear example. Later defenders of the Christian faith followed him on this road, and especially the Greek fathers based their teaching on their interpretation of the Logos as active in the pagan world.[14] Hence we are justified in inferring that already many of the first Christian preachers [15] went forth in the garb and with the methods of the contemporary teachers of phi-

[13] Acts 15: 1–35; 21: 15–26.
[14] Willmann, *Geschichte des Idealismus,* 1896, pp. 1–230.
[15] Cf. Acts 11: 19 ff.; 13: 1 ff.; 18: 24 ff.; see also Matt. 10: 9 f; Luke 9: 3.

losophy. Such preachers would naturally accommodate themselves to the world of ideas prevalent in the minds of their hearers. St. Augustine, speaking of his own times, says that the Church does not compel philosophers who were converted to change their garb or habits of life.[16] We may assume that many of the early Christian itinerant preachers, together with the garb, retained also their habits of thought.[17] We may further suppose that these itinerant preachers remained philosophers after becoming Christians. Early Christianity soon felt this influence. We notice it in a number of ways. First is the care which the New Testament writers show to prevent a misunderstanding of what they write. Secondly we have the repeated attempts on the part of Christian writers to look on philosophers like Epictetus and Seneca as Christians or at least as being influenced by Christian teaching.

The literary remains of these two philosophers and others like them are very fragmentary. Further, we are not able to sketch clearly the popular philosophy that lay behind these literary attempts since it has not been recorded at all in literary documents. Did we know the influence of popular philosophy of the living word as exercised on wide multitudes of people, we would probably be able to point out many more elements of connection between Hellenism and early Christianity in the New Testament writings. Certainly as to the relation between the two in the matter of liturgy and wor-

[16] *City of God,* XIX, 19; Migne, *PL,* XLI, 647.
[17] Cf. Acts 8: 5–24; 15: 24; 20: 29 f.

ship, a deeper knowledge of popular currents would be more fruitful than the skeptical philosophy of the higher ranks of society. For we must remember that these higher ranks did not have recourse to the mystery cults until by extreme reverence for beautiful external form Hellenism had lost its intellectual contents.

The Stoics had created a method whereby they could translate and interpret to the Grecian understanding the strange exotic Oriental religions. But in the popular religious bodies those religions still lived in their primitive originality. From these popular circles, whence came by far the greatest number of converts to youthful Christianity, we can expect no skeptical explanation or ethical interpretation. What pagan worshipers like these wanted was a representation of the mysteries that would attract their senses and their hearts: liturgy, initiation, symbolic actions, and signs. Above all, they enjoyed seeing the fate of the gods they most worshiped presented in dramatic liturgical fashion in order thereby to enliven their own hope for a similar happy fortune. They wished to have this hope made sure, particularly in some symbol of reconciliation.

In another quarter also we find this hope for a savior. We refer to the origin and propagation of emperor-worship. This worship begins by attributing to the ruler divine attributes.[18] Such a worship naturally ends in making the emperors equal to the gods. Further, to be more secure, they offer sacrifices to unknown gods, until finally the whole movement ends in a magical

18 Σωτήρ, Ἐπιφανής.

mysticism with great richness of liturgy, symbols of reconciliation, or in astrology, divination, and demonology. The end and purpose of all mystery religions, whatever may be their differences, is the salvation of the initiates. They await a new and happy life particularly by union with the divinity which is represented in many cults as the deepest meaning of their sacred repasts that serve likewise as an external bond of union for the members of the cult.

Now we would be surprised if in the Christian liturgy we should find no echoes of these things. Christianity, arising at such a time, could not entirely exclude such popular religious conceptions and currents. For these currents, in so far as they represented a real longing for true salvation, prepared the way for what Christianity alone could give. Moreover, these popular religious conceptions offered to Christianity a method of propagating its teaching. Even for its most sacred mysteries it could find in these popular images and formulas the expression for its own overflowing wealth of new and inner life. These popular religious ideas could be changed into current Christian coin and thus Christianity be made intelligible to the Hellenism by which it was surrounded.

Primitive Christian art adopted some of the elements of pagan symbolism. Christian doctrine received its philosophical formulation from Hellenism. And Christian literature was influenced by the forms of pagan literature. Hence it is but natural that ancient Christian liturgy likewise felt the influence of its Hellenistic en-

vironment. Hellenism was characterized by inward and outward harmony and thus was suited to give symbolic artistic expression to doctrine and liturgy. But, basing ourselves on the New Testament alone, we can hardly measure the influence which the Hellenistic mysteries had on primitive Christianity and its liturgy. Hence, even were we better acquainted with the Hellenistic mysteries than we are, we could not pronounce judgment without detailed investigation. Only this detailed investigation can throw light on the dark region of the relation between primitive Christian religion and syncretistic religion, between the liturgy of the mysteries and primitive Christian liturgy.

The following view, expressed by Löschcke, is incomplete and one-sided: "All in all we must admit that the Church adopted not only the Jewish, but the pagan, forms of cult. Both elements, the Jewish and the pagan, are indispensable ingredients of Christian liturgy. The Church began her existence as a Jewish sect. When she proceeded to make paganism her servant, she became a Church universal." [19] This opinion, at least as far as the New Testament is concerned, must be amplified by the following principle: in the development of Christianity as an ecumenical religion we can admit the influence of Hellenistic mystery cults on the formation of primitive Christian liturgy only when two conditions are fulfilled. These two conditions are: (1) that we can find no connection with the Jewish liturgy; (2) that the element in question is not an original con-

[19] *Jüdisches und Heidnisches im christlichen Kult,* 1910, p. 36.

tribution of Christian conviction and thought. This principle must dominate all detailed investigations.

Our next duty, then, is to examine the contribution furnished by Christianity's own life of faith to the formation of its liturgy.

CHAPTER VIII

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN LITURGY A CONSEQUENCE OF CHRISTIAN FAITH

PRIMITIVE Christianity cannot be understood historically without its historic environment, particularly without its relation to later Judaism. The very terms which we use to signify its entrance into history, namely, Paul's word of the fulfilment of time and further its own claim to be the fulfilment of the Law and the prophets, link Christianity indissolubly with the highest spiritual and religious development of Judaism. And Judaism did not become what it was without the influence of other religions and cultures, particularly as these appeared in contemporaneous Hellenism.

Likewise the formation of primitive Christian liturgy cannot be understood apart from consideration of the religious environment of the time. We cannot assert that Christianity in its original form had no innate power to develop a liturgy, that it was forced to do so by those members who came from without. Such an assertion indicates a misunderstanding of Jesus' personality and its influence on the first Christians. Just as we cannot look back to the beginning of the Jew-

ish faith in Jahve and the consequent liturgy without clearly seeing the figure of Moses, so we cannot trace Christianity to Jewish and Hellenistic influences without seeing at its origin the person of Jesus and consequently something original and new in the world. If we study the Gospels as documents of the faith, love, and fidelity of the ancient communities toward this unique personality, if we observe in the New Testament epistles testimonies of love and veneration for the glorified Lord, we recognize how strong this new life was in the hearts of the early Christians and how it became the source of liturgy. This position we must defend later on in detail.

The view we have been criticizing is untenable also for a second reason. As we have already said, primitive Christianity felt itself to be the true Israel. The emphasis did not lie so much in the Christians' insistence on being considered the continuation of contemporary Judaism as it did in their claim to be the true and perfect Judaism, to be the true Israel and at the same time a new people. In the first letter of St. Peter we have an expression of this attitude of youthful Christianity that reminds us of the most glorious times of Jewish history and literature. "Ye are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people." [1] Such conceptions were suited to infuse into the new religion a strong feeling of being a separate entity and likewise a feeling of solidarity and unity. Christians began to think of themselves as a new race, superior to the other races,

[1] 1 Pet. 2: 9.

Jews and Gentiles. It was natural then that they would give suitable expression to this their conviction.

In Antioch the disciples were first called Christians.[2] Seemingly the title was given them by non-Christians. Yet these non-Christians merely expressed what Christians themselves must have felt as their essential characteristic. For Christians regarded themselves as belonging to Christ.[3] They regarded themselves as united with the Lord and consequently as united with one another, a unity which they lovingly expressed in the image of the body, its members, and its head. They had a feeling of constant presence with one another because all belonged to Christ. The very word "Christ," originally expressing His office, now became a personal name which they applied to Him by preference. This certainty of their unity finds expression in many different passages.[4] It is likewise found in varied salutations in their letters.[5] This was the feeling that made them appear as a third people,[6] counterdistinguished from Jews and Gentiles.

This conviction appears also in their adoption of titles which belonged to the chosen people. The fact that they evidently preferred the word *ekklesia* ("church") to *synagoge* ("synagogue") shows that they were conscious of their own characteristic independence in the face of contemporary Judaism and Gentilism. It is true

2 Acts 11: 26.
3 Mark 9: 41; I Cor. 15: 23; Gal. 3: 29; 5: 24; Rom. 8: 9; 14: 8.
4 I Cor. 1: 30; II Cor. 13: 5; Gal. 1: 22; Eph. 1: 22 f.
5 Rom. 1: 6; Eph. 1: 1; Phil. 1: 1; Col. 1: 2.
6 Τρίτον γένος.

that the word *ekklesia* may signify a full popular assembly, or may be a translation of an Aramaic word that means liturgical assembly. Whichever explanation we adopt, the word expresses the unity and completeness of the Christian community, particularly when this community appears united for liturgical worship. Thus gathered for liturgical purposes, they felt themselves different from all other religious and political communities. From this viewpoint we are justified in maintaining that primitive Christianity had its own conception of worship and its own formation of the liturgy as distinguished from what they retained from Jewish influence. Primitive Christianity and liturgy, therefore, cannot be explained as derived from Judaism, certainly not as exclusively derived from Judaism. The primitive Christian liturgy is a consequence of the new life of Christians in faith.

Still less can we say that Christianity was dependent on non-Jewish influences. The conclusion becomes more cogent when we bear in mind that the early Christians regarded pagan culture as unacceptable. "The elements of higher Hellenistic culture," as Wendland says, "do indeed approach Christianity but reach only its periphery. These elements carry with them the character of what is accidental, sporadic, unconscious, and unintended." [7]

Further, the eschatological expectations [8] of the first

[7] *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur,* 1912, p. 225.

[8] Translator's note on eschatological views among primitive Christians. The First Epistle to the Thessalonians is evidence that some early Christians did, at least for a time, hold exaggerated eschatological views. But this same Epistle exemplifies the doctrine of the Apostles as corrective of those ex-

disciples of Jesus favored their cultural separation from all outside influences. Christians felt their true country to be heaven. Their doctrine is foolishness to the Gentiles, just as Gentile wisdom is foolishness to the Christians. Hence they do not speak in words of human wisdom. Evidence of this conviction is the Epistles to the Corinthians and to the Colossians. We cannot conceive that such a religion, thus opposed to pagan culture, having its citizenship in heaven, and despising earthly goods, should have adopted transitory pagan liturgical elements. Their liturgy comes principally from their own inward persuasion.

We must remember that this is the time when poverty, need, and suffering are called blessed. What light this casts on the external magnificence of the civilization that surrounds them, upon the rites of pagan mysteries! These Christians acknowledge but one value, that of each man's soul. And this value is altogether independent of birth, rank, or education. Christianity began its work rather as a deed than as a doctrine. It entered into the world as a deed of love, as a religion of redemption for all men, also for women, slaves, and the great army of the poor.

Herein we have the germ of an internal development of Christianity in the form of sacramental rites. The influence of alien systems did not need in any way to be accepted consciously and explicitly. Christians laid their chief emphasis upon their new life in Christ by sincere love of God and neighbor. His gospel was the

---

aggerations. Our author does not bring out this distinction, at least not clearly.

joyous message of the kingdom of God, of the home of the Father where there is place for all, even for those that come from the byways of life.[9]

Christians had the most splendid example of this love in the Founder of their religion, who by His life and death proclaimed God as Father. The more indelible this memory was, the less necessary was it for Christians to appeal to an outside culture, the more definitely did they exclude their pagan environment. Their eyes were directed, not to this world and its values, but to God the Father. Their new faith was the victory whereby they triumphed over the world and shared the blessedness of God. If we think of the strong sense of their own sufficiency, which from this source filled the Christian minds, we realize that on these heights they had no need to borrow from pagan gods and pagan cults.

In these days we cannot easily understand fully this mental attitude of the early Christians. Let us remember the scenes that surrounded them. The cities of the world abounded with marble temples of the gods. Within these temples the services were performed by numerous priesthoods and initiates. And these men were often relatives of the Christians. Public life as a whole was sustained by pagan worship, which was protected by the power of the state. Yet in this atmosphere of splendor we find the little group of Hellenistic Christians, generally of humble origin but nevertheless confident that they can conquer and destroy this pagan culture. They believe that their own liturgical community, which they designate with the proud name of

[9] Acts 4: 32—5: 16.

"church" (*ekklesia*) will outlast all these pagan societies. Both these elements—their rejection of pagan culture and their sense of sufficiency—show that early Christianity had the power to form its own liturgy and worship. How strong this power was will appear in the second part of this book. We here add a few general remarks.

The unity which Christians had through Christ with God and consequently with one another was the bridge leading from Jewish Christianity to Gentile Christianity. On both sides Christians believed in the glorified Lord and thus grew into the unity proclaimed by St. Paul: "In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek . . . neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus"; [10] "for in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but only faith working through charity." [11]

This life, however unified, developed in one way in Jerusalem, in another way in Asia Minor, in still another way in Rome. But always and everywhere it was a spiritual unity with worldwide fulness of life. Each separate Church was conscious of being one with all other Churches, was conscious that itself was a concrete picture of the universal Church. Hence it must be evident that this unity, this simultaneous individuality and universality must have been particularly efficacious when the Church came together for its liturgical worship.

There is still a third reason for maintaining that the early Christian Church was individual and personal in

[10] Gal. 3: 28.
[11] Gal. 5: 6; cf. I Cor. 12: 4 f.; Eph. 2: 11–22; Col. 3: 11; John 10: 16.

its piety and liturgy. That reason lies in the personality of its first members, particularly in the case of the Apostles. "The man who, in the chief letters of Paul, cannot detect individual religious life, has entirely lost the sense of historical investigation in this field." [12] From this source came some of the most important and fundamental influences to bear on the formation of Christian liturgy.

All the disciples of Jesus began after His death to understand in a far deeper way the meaning of His words and deeds. Hence their words and works are often not a mere mechanical remembrance of the words and works of Jesus, but manifest the difference of their personalities. Their own conceptions, their own piety, is even in liturgical matters sometimes decisive and directive. Their lowly origin and their general lack of Hellenistic culture, and their enthusiasm for the risen Lord would lead them to an independent development of the liturgy.

Consider St. Paul. His strong personality bound many communities into one, communities which were found here and there through the Roman provinces. In the preaching of St. Peter and St. James we find the same personal influence. The same may be said of those who are not reckoned among the pillars of the Church. It is particularly noticeable in the author of the Apocalypse. He sends the seven letters from Patmos to the seven cities whose circumstances he knows exactly and whom he addresses in a tone of authority.

If we remember these three things—the personality

[12] Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 212. See *supra*, note 7.

of Jesus, the unity of the Church and the personal influence of Jesus' first disciples—we are fully justified in maintaining that the origin and development of the primitive Christian liturgy was not owing to external influences alone, but must rather be traced to the new life of faith of the early Christians. In what follows we try to show this truth in detail.

CHAPTER IX

LITURGY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

TRADITION is strongly emphasized in the writings of St. Paul, particularly when he comes to speak of the liturgy.[1] By tradition the Apostle tries to modify the enthusiasm of the early Christians and to bring it into the quiet paths of suitable public order. This situation prevents us from stressing too much the part which private Christians played in the formation of the early liturgy. But on the other hand such passages imply that the early disciples, still under the impression of the historical personality of Jesus, still in the most intimate union with the glorified Lord, and still under the immediate direction of the divine Spirit, knew well how to distinguish what had come directly from the Lord and what was for the sake of order and decency commanded by their leaders. They were consequently aware of certain questions that were left to be decided by the influences in their community. We therefore endeavor here to discover these influences that were

[1] I Cor. 11: 23.

active in the bosom of primitive Christianity. We are restricted in our investigation to New Testament literature. And we must begin with St. Paul.

St. Paul's conversion led him at first to stress the spiritual and moral character of the new religion. This position guides him also in judging all external worship. We must not, however, expect to find him all the way through unchanging in the details of his attitude. We must remember the double relation he occupied toward the traditional liturgy, that is, toward the Temple, the synagogue, and the Law. On the one hand, then, St. Paul entered inwardly into the spirit of Christianity as no other Christian did, and took his new possession as the starting point of his activity and as the one solution of all questions he would meet. Yet, on the other hand, we find him struggling with the relation of the new free faith to the Old Testament revelation. Likewise we find him carrying Jewish mentality and Jewish liturgical conceptions into his new life of faith. Even in matters that are seemingly subordinate but which are nevertheless of great importance in those circles of society into which Christianity entered, we find the same willingness to develop his teaching and to adapt it to circumstances as they arose.

First we find a number of passages which show with what inner freedom Paul confronted Jewish custom. Thus, for instance, he emphasizes indifference to Jewish regulations about food and ablutions.[2] He attaches no importance to Jewish asceticism in food and drink.[3]

[2] I Cor. 6: 13; 9: 4.
[3] Rom. 15: 17.

Again, he has hard words against Jewish festivals and customs just as he has against the elements of pagan cults. "How can you turn again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereto you wish once again to be enslaved? Ye observe days and months and seasons and years. I fear I have perchance toiled among you in vain." [4]

The same admonition recurs in the letter to the Colossians (2: 8): "See to it that there be no man making you his spoil by force of his philosophy and deceitful fancies, following the traditions of men, following the elements of the world, and not following Christ." This entire passage is permeated with mystic and liturgical thoughts. The very term "tradition" [5] is a technical term of Jewish Hellenistic liturgical language. Hence many surmises about the meaning of "elements of the world" are without purpose. Undoubtedly the writer is here battling against worship of the gods of the elements and the doctrines and customs in which that worship is expressed.

Again, we find this admonition in Col. 2: 16, where St. Paul, with the same energy, protests against external liturgical customs. "Let no one then sit in judgment on you in respect of eating or drinking or in a matter of a feast day or a new moon or a Sabbath: such things are a shadow of things to come, but the substance is of Christ." Once more we find in Col. 2: 20–22: "Why do ye subject yourselves to ordinances such as 'Handle not nor taste nor even touch'—things which

[4] Gal. 4: 9 ff.
[5] Παράδοσις.

are all perishable in their use? This were to follow the precepts and doctrines of men." These passages harmonize with the teaching in Romans: [6] "The kingdom of God consists not in eating and drinking, but in justice, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." On passages like these the surmise has been made that Paul regarded the synagogal worship merely as an opportunity for preaching the Gospel, and that he did not allow his community to share in that worship, since from the beginning he was aware that here he must build something entirely new on a new foundation.

This freedom from traditional external worship came to Paul from his faith in Christ. For each of the faithful, Christ is the end and purpose of the Law.[7] Hence none of them should ever again put his head under the yoke of slavery.[8] Christians have but one law, that of Christ,[9] or that of the Spirit.[10] The law of the spirit of life liberates man from the former law of flesh and of death. Consequently it liberates him also from the former external worship, from all its rites and festivals. The Christian does not need such things since his possession of the Spirit, whose temple each Christian is,[11] as also is each Christian community,[12] makes him a sharer in the sonship of God. For him neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any importance, but only the faith that works by charity. Thus Paul in his Christian sense of

[6] Rom. 14: 17.
[7] Rom. 10: 4.
[8] Gal. 5: 1.
[9] II Cor. 10: 5.
[10] Rom. 8: 2.
[11] I Cor. 6: 19.
[12] I Cor. 3: 16.

freedom, in his possession of the Spirit, withdraws from the Jewish external worship.

But, on the other hand, he carries with him into the communities he founds Jewish customs and practices wherever they seem to him necessary or useful in the eyes of the Jews. This practice might at first sight seem to be born of opportunism. And it might at first sight surprise us when we remember the inner attitude that has just been described. Further, in Acts 15: 20–22, 29, we find that he accepts certain precepts which for similar reasons were given by others. In this passage we see an influence that comes from the Jewish liturgy. Some things are regarded as clean, some as unclean, but Jesus taught that goodness and badness is in the heart. It may even be possible that in Paul's relations with the Jews he went farther in this direction than we can today discover. Possibly the collected alms to which Gentile Christians had bound themselves are meant as a parallel to the regular gifts for the Temple made by Jewish proselytes. There is a sentence in Romans (15: 27) which might seem to point to this explanation: "For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, they ought also in carnal things to minister to them."

Yet with all this we cannot doubt that the fundamental attitude of the Apostle, since by his conversion at Damascus he had broken with his Jewish past, is the emphasis on the spiritual nature of Christianity. This new faith takes entire possession of him. Hence we would not be just to his religious personality if we did not consider the influence of his Jewish past upon him. But

we would be still less just to him if we did not consider the fact of his spiritual union with the risen and glorified Christ.

In Galatians (5: 25) he lays down his principle. "If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit." And this principle determines his views on the right kind of divine worship. According to Acts 17: 24, 25, 28, at Athens he made use of this principle before the Gentiles in the following words: "God, who made the world and all things therein, He, being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither hath He need of aught. . . . In Him we live and move and have our being, as also some of your poets have said, 'for we are His very offspring.' " Here as often elsewhere we find Paul's development of his thought in full agreement with the Fourth Gospel, often called the spiritual Gospel.[13]

Still more emphatic is the exhortation he addresses to the Romans (12: 1): "Present your bodies a sacrifice, living, holy, well pleasing to God, your reasonable service." At the beginning of this letter he expresses his own relation to God as a worship in the spirit (as in Phil. 3: 3, all Christians are called worshipers of God in spirit); and toward the end of the letter we have the expression, "you have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear, but you have received the spirit of adoption as sons." In the middle of the letter (8: 15) we have an expression of liturgical solemnity: "in whom we cry Abba, Father." In these passages we see that the Christians regarded the liturgy as a work of the divine Spirit. Hence

[13] See especially John 4: 21 ff.

we are justified in claiming the Greek word λογικός in our passage (12: 1) as equivalent to πνευματικός ("spiritual"). We are confirmed in this conclusion by a similar phrase in the first letter of St. Peter (2: 5): "Offer spiritual sacrifices well pleasing to God through Jesus Christ."

Whence comes this expression, "spiritual sacrifice"? It is not to be found in the Septuagint. But it is found in the prayers of the Greek-speaking synagogue. Hence it may have come from there to the Apostle without any direct Hellenistic influence. In its first meaning the expression is applied to the prayer of the mystic, or rather to the Logos (*Pneuma*), who dwells in the mystic. A natural consequence of this meaning was that the manner of sacrifice must be suited to the nature of the Logos, hence must be spiritual. Thus the two words (λογικός and πνευματικός) become identical in meaning.

St. Paul's meaning, then, in this passage (Rom. 12: 1) is that his brethren shall offer their bodies to God as a living, holy, and pleasing sacrifice. And that in so doing they offer spiritual worship. Hence, since in the above passage spiritual sacrifice stands in apposition to the whole sentence and not only to the word "bodies," we must conclude that St. Paul admits spiritual sacrifice existing in each Christian, a sacrifice worthy of the divine Logos (or *Pneuma*) who is really present in each Christian.

We need not be surprised that this image, coming as it does from Hellenism, is employed by St. Paul in exhortations to Gentile Christians (cf. Rom. 11: 13). But the image is completed by the Jewish sacrificial idea, which cannot conceive worship of God without sacri-

fice. This idea even the synagogue had not abrogated, but had in some measure spiritualized. Hence St. Paul urges also his pagan Christian converts to look upon their own moral Christian lives as immolations whereby they offer their bodies as living, holy, and pleasing sacrifices.

We cannot conclude from this passage that St. Paul knows no other sacrifice than that of moral conduct of life. But, on the other hand, we see that the idea of sacrifice does here enter into the moral field. Hence the phrase "spiritual sacrifice," where the Greek word πνευματική is contrasted with the word σωματική, does have a note of contrast with the sacrifices both Jewish and Gentile which include an external element that is material or even bloody. Now, when St. Paul put in place of this external element the Christian moral life, he still sees that life borne up by a life of prayer, of a constant crying of the spirit, "Abba, Father." And this we must understand to hold true not only in the silence of each one's heart, but also in the full assembly of the saints. Both these elements belong to spiritual sacrifice. Passages are to be found in the Old Testament which justify this application of a word derived from Hellenistic (syncretistic) mysticism.[14] All these passages say that God receives as pleasing sacrifice not the blood of beasts, but words of thanksgiving and praise.

We must notice some other terms closely related to the foregoing. The word λατρεία outside our present passage is used by St. Paul only once (Rom. 9: 4). His favorite words for this conception of moral life as sacri-

14 Ps. 49: 23; Is. 57: 19; Osee 14: 3; Prov. 18: 20; 10: 31; cf. Heb. 13: 15.

fice are δουλεία and δουλεύειν. This usage we find in Rom. 14: 18; 16: 18. In the last passage, instead of saying that the Christian is enslaved to God, St. Paul says the Christian is enslaved to Christ. In I Thess. 1: 9 f., we notice a variation. His hearers have turned away from idolatry to be slaves to the living and true God. Whereas their relation to Christ is expressed by the words, "They await His Son from the heavens." In no other passage of the New Testament do we find δουλεύειν made equivalent to λατρεύειν.

Narrower in its meaning is another term, θρησκεία. In St. Paul the word appears only in Col. 2: 18. There it signifies a liturgical worship offered to angels.

The technical priestly word for service and sacrifice is "liturgy" (λειτουργία). It is important to notice that in that same letter to the Romans where St. Paul speaks of the spiritual sacrifices of Christians, he calls himself a λειτουργόν (priest) of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles (Rom. 15: 16). He goes on to describe how his priesthood is exercised among the Gentiles. He is a priest in the service of God's gospel, that the sacrifice of the Gentiles may be acceptable, being sanctified in the Holy Spirit. Here again the context shows us how an expression that so far had been a liturgical *terminus technicus,* is by St. Paul extended to signify service of God in a broader sense. Thus here, for instance, it is used to signify what Christ has done through His Apostle "unto the obedience of the Gentiles, in word and work, with power of signs and wonders, with power of the Holy Spirit." [15]

All these passages might sound as though they ex-

[15] Rom. 15: 18 f.

cluded external worship. We cannot conceive that St. Paul is here dealing simply with applications of a liturgy that he has carried with him from the past. Any liturgy that is not spiritual is for St. Paul a thing abrogated.

But can we find in St. Paul elements of a new liturgy in the proper sense of the word as we understand it today? To this question the passages we have so far studied give no direct answer. But other passages give a different picture.

From his past he brought with him conceptions of sacrifice and definite images of sacred rites. These ideas and images must have influenced the origin and development of liturgical views in primitive Christianity. And simultaneously we find these same views not only among the converts from Judaism, but also among the Gentile converts. As an example of these views let us note the passage in I Cor. 10: 1–4: "For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea unto the following of Moses, and all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink (for they drank from the spiritual rock . . . and the rock was Christ)."

These verses are the introduction to St. Paul's discussion about the right to eat meat that has been offered to idols. Beneath the passage lies the image of the Israelites, during their wanderings in the desert, as entirely covered with a cloud and surrounded by it as with water. This image is based not on Ex. 13: 21, but on Ps. 104: 39, and on Wis. 10: 17.

On this image is based the idea of the Israelites being baptized in Moses as Christians are baptized in Christ.

Likewise from the Book of Psalms and the Book of Wisdom comes the designation of the manna and of the water as spiritual. In Ps. 77: 24 and Wis. 16: 20, the manna is called the bread of heaven and the food of angels. These two expressions are equivalent to "supernatural."

St. Paul's exegesis of the rock strikes us as strange. We are here dealing with a midrash, a tradition from rabbinic literature, explaining a passage in Numbers (21: 17 f.). St. Paul makes use of this tradition to place also a heavenly drink for ancient Israel side by side with the well-known heavenly food. For St. Paul the emphasis lies on the three parallels: between Israelites and Christians, between Moses and Christ, between Old Testament sacraments and New Testament sacraments (heavenly food and baptism). These sacraments are not represented as absolute guaranty of salvation. They do not release the individual from moral responsibility, but still they are more than a mere spiritual worship. They are symbolic verities, liturgical realities for all, and they receive their special present meaning from the account which St. Paul gives of the sacred banquet of Christians.

Christ was the real author of what was done by Moses. This aspect of the Old Testament serves to make intelligible the union of the Church with Christ. But in so far as the passage shows us external elements as cooperating in producing this union with Christ, the passage forms a transition to liturgical rites among Christians themselves.

Another source of liturgical beginnings is to be found

in St. Paul's activity among the Gentile Christians. His youth had been passed in the atmosphere of Oriental syncretism. He could easily find points of contact for the announcement and propagation of the new faith. Hence we should know something of the Christian communities recruited from the Gentile world.

For the Gentile world conversion meant repentance, a turning away from their idols to the one true God.[16] It meant, in the words of St. Paul, that they were to serve the living and true God and to expect from the heavens His Son, whom He raised up from the dead, Jesus, who delivers us from the wrath to come.[17] In these and similar expressions that so often recur in the writings of St. Paul we find his mode of appeal to pagan ears and the beginnings of a Christian liturgy.

The passage last cited, which so strongly emphasizes the Parousia, might at first sight be urged against the development of a Christian liturgy as distinguished from the Jewish liturgy. It might be argued that at a time when many Christians were much impressed with the thought of Christ's second coming, they would not merely have no concern for earthly affairs, but would not even think of developing their own specific Christian liturgy. This argument is unsound. The very term used to signify their second birth, namely, turning to God from idols, was known to them from their ancient religion as a rite of initiation. It had always been connected with liturgical and sacred acts. Hence we have here the beginning of a movement to express by external

[16] Acts 3: 19; 11: 21; 15: 3.
[17] I Thess. 1: 9 f.

symbol what the community was experiencing in its heart.

Further, spiritual experiences which affect a whole community tend to express themselves in symbols. Naturally the symbolic acts with which they were familiar in their pagan days—turnings of the body, imposition of hands, exorcisms, anointings with oil, and other such expressions of religion—were retained when they were celebrating the Christian mystery. Their expectation of the Parousia would find expression not merely in spiritual words and prayers, but also in an external worship of the glorified Lord, with whom they were already united. The discussion to follow later on in this book about St. Paul's relation to his glorified Lord, and about his idea of the sacred banquet, will show still more clearly how far his influence on Christian liturgy reached.

We are not to expect in St. Paul a complete development of the relation between spiritual service and liturgical worship. Here it suffices to say that the line of development after St. Paul leads to the early Christian apologists, who find in the Eucharistic sacrifice the worship of God in spirit and in truth.[18]

OTHER NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

St. Paul's conception of the right kind of spiritual worship recurs in other New Testament writings. As St. Paul insists on a worship that is fundamentally spirit-

[18] Cf. O. Casel, *Die Liturgie als Mysterienfeier*, 1923, pp. 115–26.

ual, so likewise does St. Peter. "Be ye built up into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices well pleasing to God through Jesus Christ." [19] A few verses later St. Peter calls Christians a royal priesthood. The context of the entire passage is an admonition to Christian neophytes that they should remember the effects and the duties of their new birth. Starting with this image, St. Peter addresses them as new-born babes, yearning for the spiritual milk, which is Christ. This milk signifies uncontaminated spiritual food.[20] Hence we have here thoughts that agree with those of St. Paul.[21] If the neophytes act thus, they will grow into a holy community. Hence, changing the figure, St. Peter calls them living stones for building a spiritual temple, the cornerstone of which is Christ. Again the image changes slightly, and Christians are urged to come to Him, the living cornerstone, and to be built up through Him into a spiritual temple of which they are the cornerstones, since they themselves perform priestly functions and hence are temple and priesthood simultaneously.[22]

This passage shows the Christian sense of their own sublimity and dignity. The spirituality of the house, the emphasis on the living Christ, Christ who gives and preserves life for His followers, all these traits reveal to them how sublime their state is as contrasted with those who have rejected this cornerstone and for whom it is a

[19] I Pet. 2: 5.
[20] I Pet. 2: 1 ff.
[21] I Cor. 10: 1 ff.; cf. I Cor. 3: 2.
[22] I Pet. 2: 4 f.

stone of scandal.[23] Instead of the Jews and their Temple, God has now chosen the Christian people as His own religious community and people. The Christians no longer have the stone temple at Jerusalem, but they themselves, by their union with Christ, become living spiritual stones and thus form the spiritual temple of His splendor and offer to Him as priests spiritual sacrifices.

As we read the letter we can see that its author, a Jew grown old in the traditions of his race, regarded the Temple as the symbol which expressed the superiority of his traditional religion and consequently is an image of the new religion. The solution he gives, which is the same as that given by Paul, is that Christians are a spiritual temple exercising a spiritual worship by their Christian manner of life. This solution, by which Christians become a race of priests,[24] has far-reaching importance. St. Peter emphasizes the spiritual moral worship and regards it as more sublime than the traditional Jewish worship.

Conduct of life is the right kind of divine worship. This idea was a commonplace among the early Christians. Thus we find in St. Luke (1: 74 f.) Zacharias, the pious Jewish priest, praising the fruit of the Messianic time in these words: "To grant us that, being delivered from our enemies, we might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness." The letter of St. James reflects the same ideal. Pure and undefiled worship consists in caring for orphans and widows, and in preserving

[23] I Pet. 2: 4 ff.
[24] Cf. Ex. 19: 6.

oneself unspotted from the world.[25] Such thoughts, it is true, were common among the Jews, particularly in the prophets and in the psalms. But they receive Christian coloring from the Christians' idea of their life as spiritual and wise.[26] Partially also as a consequence of their eschatological views,[27] they feel themselves bound to this mode of serving God by a life of charity.

We must notice that the duties which Christians thus take upon themselves explicitly include prayer.[28] Thus we have introduced a conception which appears also in other sources, that the prayer of the Christian is a spiritual worship. In the letter to the Hebrews [29] we find both ideas united. When the author describes genuine sacrifice, he mentions first of all prayer, "the fruit of lips which confess His name," [30] and in the second place a life of benefits to one's neighbor. "For with such sacrifices God is well pleased." And these sacrifices are opposed to the pagan sacrifices by the fact that they are offered through Christ and become pleasing to God through Christ.[31] Finally, St. Jude (v. 20) speaks of the prayer of Christians made in the Holy Ghost, whereas the Gnostics are without this Spirit and consequently serve evil lusts (v. 19).

According to the Acts of the Apostles the reception of the Holy Ghost was the origin of the Christian Church.[32]

[25] Jas. 1: 27.
[26] Jas. 3: 13 ff.
[27] Jas. 5: 7 ff.
[28] Jas. 5: 13.
[29] Heb. 13: 15 f.
[30] Cf. Lev. 7: 12; Ps. 49: 14, 23.
[31] Heb. 13: 20 f.
[32] Acts 2: 1–41.

This Spirit was likewise a gift which each new convert received on entering the Church.[33] The Jews had expected that in the new Messianic time they would receive in abundant measure the fulness of the Spirit. But Christians are convinced that they already possess that Spirit in its fulness and are living in a new age.[34] They are convinced that they have that same Spirit of God who accompanied the public life of Jesus.[35] And in closest union with the account of the communication of the Spirit we find their continuance in prayer emphasized.[36] Elsewhere also we often find mention of the mutual relation of the Spirit and prayer.[37]

We must notice that the gifts of the Holy Ghost produced not only spiritual prayer and the worship that consists in a worthy manner of life. The letter of St. James shows clearly that alongside that worship which consisted in deeds of charity there went hand in hand liturgical actions. We see this especially when he condemns his hearers as acting in their own liturgical service contrary to that worship of God which consists in genuine charity.[38] Elsewhere also we find that the divine Spirit which works in men leads them from private prayer to public liturgical prayer. The communication of the Spirit, His indwelling and His revelations, manifest themselves not only in an internal intercourse between God and men, but also in sensible manifestations

[33] Acts 2: 38.
[34] Matt. 10: 20; Luke 24: 49; Acts 1: 4 f.; 2: 15–21, 33; 9: 31.
[35] Matt. 3: 16; 4: 1; Mark 1: 10 ff.; Luke 3: 22; 4: 1; John 1: 32; Acts 10: 38.
[36] Acts 1: 14; 2: 42.
[37] Acts 4: 31; 8: 15; 13: 2 f.
[38] Jas. 2: 1–13.

of that intercourse. Even the coming of the Spirit upon the Apostles is accompanied by outward symbols.[39]

Similar ideas we find in St. John. "Unless a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God. . . . Unless a man be born of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. . . . That which is born of the Spirit." [40] The word πνεῦμα ("spirit") means both spirit and wind. "The wind bloweth whither it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof. So it is with everyone that is born of the Spirit." The Jewish theologian Nicodemus was unable to understand the necessity of such a new and heavenly birth in order that carnal man should become spiritual. But the word was quite intelligible to Hellenistic converts, particularly from the circles of the Oriental mysteries. These converts, as in fact all men of ancient times, could not conceive spiritual things unless they were expressed in sensible signs and symbols. Hence these converts found it natural that the communication of the Spirit should be associated with the use of baptismal water, tongues of fire, and the blowing of the wind. They would likewise easily understand the meaning of the imposition of hands, which together with prayer was the ordinary means of communicating the Spirit.[41]

If we turn to the Acts of the Apostles, we find the Jewish custom of uniting fasting with prayer presented in the story of Paul and Barnabas. "As they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said: Set

[39] Acts 2: 2 ff.
[40] John 3: 3 ff.
[41] Acts 8: 14 ff.

apart for Me Barnabas and Saul unto the work to which I have called them. Thereupon, after fasting and prayer, they laid their hands upon them and let them go." [42] We do not insist on the Greek λειτουργεῖν ("ministering") in the foregoing passage. But this passage, if we consider its context and also the community to which it refers, brings us very close to definitely established liturgical forms. We have here first a preparatory service of prayer; secondly, the act of fasting that accompanies it; and thirdly, the consecrating act [43] consisting of the imposition of hands. Further, we feel that within the external ceremonies lies the conviction that the Spirit is given more easily when the entire community is assembled, because Christ Himself is present when the brethren are gathered together.[44] Hence the community acts as a spiritual community, particularly at times of public worship. We notice different classes in this community. Some are set apart as being privileged bearers of the Spirit. Hence not all the members of the community enjoy this mode of communicating the power of the Spirit. Moreover, we notice that just as the Spirit comes from above, so in other passages when the Spirit appears heaven opens and there is perfect intercourse between the assembled Christians and the supernatural world that stands open before them.[45] Further, we have the conception that the prayers of the faithful thus assembled are carried by the angels who are present [46] to the

[42] Acts 13: 2 f.
[43] Cf. Num. 27: 18.
[44] Matt. 18: 20; 28: 20.
[45] Matt. 3: 16 f.; John 1: 51; Acts 7: 55 f.
[46] I Cor. 11: 10.

altar on high in the heavens. Similar ideas we find in the letter to the Hebrews and in the Apocalypse. Thus the liturgy in heaven becomes the exemplar of the liturgy on earth.

In passages like these we have certainly an advance over the conception that would restrict liturgical worship to the leading of a Christian moral life. And this idea is supported by reflecting both on the Jewish liturgical customs which one class of converts brought with them, and the Hellenistic mystery practices which the other class of converts would bring with them.

Hence we find not only in the writings of St. Paul, but in the other New Testament writings, the beginnings of a liturgy as distinct from the leading of a moral life. This result is what we should expect. In all forms of religion the spiritual sacrifice of one's life to God in justice and charity, as demanded by the Old Testament prophets, never fails to urge men to express this sacrifice in external definite forms of liturgy. The Christian community is no exception. Their position in this matter is based on ancient Jewish ideas which underlie the texts we have quoted from the New Testament: [47] without sacrifice, no liturgical worship. The reason underlying this conception is not an apologetic tendency to find fulfilment of the prophecy of Malachias (1: 11). Rather the reason lies in the fact that, as we shall show more in detail later on, the life led by Christians was felt by them to be spiritually united with their worship.

Let us not take this series of doctrines, admonitions, images, and memories as separated and unrelated ele-

[47] See especially Rom. 12: 1; I Pet. 2: 5.

ments. Let us rather consider them in their totality, above all in their relation to the sacred banquet of the primitive Christians, in union also with the New Testament teaching of the sacrificial death of Christ, and lastly with their memory of Him as the glorified Lord. Only when we consider these elements from this viewpoint can we find in them the formative powers which with inner necessity brought about Christian liturgy in the proper and most characteristic sense of the word. The two main elements which must now occupy our attention are the liturgical worship which primitive Christianity offered to its glorified Lord, and the light in which primitive Christians viewed the death of Christ.

CHAPTER X

LITURGICAL WORSHIP OF JESUS, THE DYING AND RISEN LORD

IN the person of Jesus lies all human salvation. This is the Credo of early Christianity. On this creed are based more or less explicitly the passages we have been quoting from St. Peter and St. Paul. When St. Peter urges Christians to come near the living cornerstone, Christ, in order to become with him a spiritual house, we see clearly expressed the thought that they become this spiritual temple, this holy priestly people, only in and through Jesus, their glorified Lord.[1] Here also we have the name "Christ" substituted for the name "Jesus."[2] Thus we see repeated the image which St. Paul uses in I Cor. 3: 11 and in Eph. 2: 20. Here also we should note the phrase from the Acts which says that salvation is to be found in none but Jesus,[3] since no other name has been given to men wherein they may be saved. And we need only note in passing how frequently St. John has similar expressions. Christ is the life of

[1] I Pet. 2: 4.
[2] I Pet. 2: 5.
[3] Acts 4: 12.

men.[4] Christ is the vine in whom Christians are the branches and hence only in Him can bring forth blossoms and fruit.[5] He is the light that illumines all men.[6]

We do not need here to develop in detail the essential elements of this salvation. All we need say is that it consists in a true and real union with God, which is conceivable only through Christ. Only through Christ have Christians access to God.[7]

The importance of this position of Christ is everywhere evident in the New Testament. The spiritual worship which consists in Christian life, the privilege of being a royal priestly people, is possible to Christians only in and through their union with Christ. The communication of the Spirit is given to them through Christ. This union with Christ gives them their life of faith, their name and position as Christians. It makes them a third people, makes them Christ's in all things, in their life, in their worship, in their relation to one another and to the world. "For us there is only one God, the Father, from whom come all things, and in whom we live; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and through whom we live." [8] This text is a brief Christology of early Christianity.

The formula "in Christ" or "through Christ" designates the most intimate life union with Christ.[9] The living Christ forms with the Christian community one

[4] John 1: 4; 3: 36; 5: 40; 6: 33 f.; 10: 10; 11: 25; 14: 6; I John 1: 2; 5: 12.
[5] John 15: 5.
[6] John 1: 9; 8: 12; 12: 46; cf. I Pet. 2: 9; Eph. 5: 8 f.; Matt. 5: 14, 16.
[7] John 16: 23, 34; Rom. 5: 1 ff.; Eph. 2: 18; 3: 12; Col. 3: 17.
[8] I Cor. 8: 6.
[9] Gal. 3: 28; 5: 6; I Cor. 1: 30; Rom. 6: 11.

whole, just as the soul and the body form one entity, and just as head and members form a single entity. Christ before the resurrection and Christ after the resurrection are the same. St. Paul expresses this truth about Christ in a striking phrase: "They crucified the Lord of glory." [10] And through this Lord of glory they feel themselves united to the "one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in all." [11]

God is Father of Christians only by their union with Christ, who is their mediator with the Father. Thus the truth is expressed in many salutations in the letters of St. Paul. It is expressed also by St. John [12] and in passages like Matt. 11: 27 and Luke 10: 22.

Both Jews and Gentiles invoked the divinity through the intercession of mediators. But at the same time we realize on reading passages like the above, that independently of this relation to other liturgical forms the early Christians' life of prayer must have led them finally to specific forms of liturgical veneration for their mediator and their Lord. If, as we shall see later, this expectation is fulfilled, we are to remember that the source from which the development comes is the mediation of Jesus.

In another way also we may see how this development of Christian liturgical worship from the Jewish life of faith and the pagan mysteries is pointed out in a special manner by St. Paul. St. Paul says before the Roman governor (Acts 24: 14): "I worship the God of our fa-

[10] I Cor. 2: 8.
[11] Eph. 4: 6.
[12] John 3: 1–21.

thers." When now we see St. Paul go on to explain that the only point wherein he differs from his adversaries is that he believes in the resurrection of the dead, we recognize that his interest at the moment was an apologetic one. But in reality he had long been separated from the Jewish community by his belief in the glorified Lord as being identical with the historical Christ. Without this belief his words, "I worship God," are unintelligible. In his conception the evil of paganism lay in the fact that the pagans did not glorify God as God, and did not give thanks.[13] Hence for him there is only one mode of glorifying and thanking God, and that is through the name of Jesus Christ, or in the name of Jesus Christ.[14] Over and over again he is led to this kind of hymn of praise. If he enjoys redemption, salvation, peace, and access to God, he must thank Jesus for it.

One passage in the letter to the Romans expresses this conviction in a most undoubted manner. The thought is re-echoed by all New Testament writers with such clearness that it must be accepted as the common Credo of primitive Christianity. The passage runs thus: "Let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have obtained access by faith into this grace wherein we stand." [15] This passage helps us to understand how Paul wished to bring no other Gospel to his communities than that of Jesus the crucified.[16] Likewise, when addressing the Corinthians,[17] he calls

[13] Rom. 1: 21.
[14] Rom. 1: 8; 7: 25.
[15] Rom. 5: 1 f.
[16] I Cor. 2: 2; Gal. 3: 1; 6: 14.
[17] II Cor. 5: 19.

his Gospel the word of reconciliation. But all these privileges come from God, who has reconciled us with Himself through Christ [18] and has placed us in the service of this reconciliation, since it was God who in Christ reconciled the world to Himself.[19]

The Christology of the New Testament is not limited to passages which present salvation as given through Christ or in Christ. We have passages, particularly in St. Paul, which imply the equality of the glorified Christ and God. Often in his salutations Paul wishes his hearers grace and peace from God and Christ. Jesus the Lord appears not merely as mediator, but as giver, of peace and all good gifts.[20] Christ is the Lord of peace,[21] just as God is called the God of peace.[22] Christ is called the Savior [23] who forgives sins,[24] just as God is called Savior.[25] Christ is full of power.[26] His name is glorified and praised and called upon.[27]

In the name of Jesus all knees shall bow, of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and all tongues shall confess that Jesus is Lord.[28] In Christ dwells the fulness of the Godhead corporeally. Thus the name of Jesus stands on a par with the kingdom of God which Jesus came to announce. Thus it comes to pass

[18] Rom. 5: 10.
[19] Rom. 5: 18.
[20] Col. 3: 15.
[21] II Thess. 3: 16.
[22] I Thess. 5: 23.
[23] Luke 2: 11; John 4: 42; Acts 13: 23.
[24] Acts 10: 43; I John 2: 12; cf. Mark 2: 7; Eph. 5: 26 f.
[25] Luke 1: 47; I Tim. 1: 1; 2: 3; 4: 10.
[26] Eph. 6: 10.
[27] Acts 9: 14, 21; 22: 16.
[28] Phil. 2: 10 f.

that Christians are defined as thòse who call upon Jesus' name.[29] As there is a kingdom of God, so there is a kingdom of Christ,[30] or a kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.[31] Hence the early Christians believed that Jesus had gone away from His disciples in order to bring back to them His kingdom from heaven and to reveal Himself as Lord and King of that kingdom: "that he may be Lord both of the dead and of the living." [32]

Jewish Hellenism was accustomed to call Jahve by the name of "Lord." The New Testament writings employ the name "Lord" sometimes for God and sometimes for Christ. Thus we have a primitive Christian invocation: "O Lord Jesus." [33] We have the statement that only in the Holy Ghost can this invocation be made.[34] Consequently we hear the Christians address also their public prayer directly to Jesus. Lastly, this growing consciousness of being members of the kingdom of God and Christ leads them to show veneration to their God-King, which is liturgical worship. Hence we may hold that the phrase "every knee shall bend," in the Epistle to the Philippians, is based on actual liturgical practice.

But in the prayers of Christians we find another name used more commonly than the name "Lord" or "Savior." It is the solemn name, παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ.[35] "The God of

[29] Acts 9: 14, 21.
[30] Eph. 5: 5.
[31] II Pet. 1: 11; cf. Matt. 13: 41; 16: 28; 20: 21; Luke 23: 42; Col. 1: 13; II Tim. 4: 1, 18.
[32] Rom. 14: 9.
[33] Acts 7: 59; I Cor. 16: 22; Apoc. 22: 20.
[34] I Cor. 12: 3.
[35] Child of God, Servant of God.

our fathers hath glorified His servant, whom ye denied before Pilate." [36] "God hath sent His servant, whom He hath raised, to bless you." [37] "For of a truth were gathered together in this city against Thy holy servant Jesus . . . Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel." [38] "Stretching out Thy hand to work healing and signs and wonders through the name of Thy holy servant Jesus." [39] In all these passages, all occurring at an early stage in the development of the Christian community, we have the thought that the name of Jesus conveys powers of salvation in favor of the Christian community. Hence here again we feel that the invocation of the name of Jesus leads to a liturgical veneration of Him who bears the name.

We must further notice that the expression "servant of God" stands in the closest union with Isaias' account of "the servant of God" who was betrayed by His people and suffered and died for them. But this death was not in vain. This death, ending in the resurrection, became a means of salvation even for those who betrayed Him to Pilate and thus were guilty of His death. It is interesting to notice how, when the first Christians read this prophecy, they interpreted it in specific Christian terms.[40] When, therefore, the first Christians prayed to Christ, the name that naturally came to their lips was that of the holy servant of God prophesied by Isaias. In St. Paul's language this "servant of God" is the "Son of

[36] Acts 3: 13.
[37] Acts 3: 26.
[38] Acts 4: 27.
[39] Acts 4: 30.
[40] Acts 8: 32 ff.

God." He says: "God hath not spared His own Son, but hath delivered Him for all of us." [41]

In this passage we have clear echoes of an early symbol of faith. We are thus strengthened in the surmise that lines of thought like these we have just heard from St. Paul, just as they influenced the formation of the Creed, so they influenced the liturgy in its origin. The image of Christ Jesus interceding for us in heaven will meet us in a still more striking manner in the letter to the Hebrews. But the passage just quoted from Romans, taken in its context, shows that the historical deed of the redemption performed by Jesus has eternal value and is rendered personal to each of His members by His intercession. Hence we naturally expect that Christians would endeavor to secure to themselves this personal value in the work of the glorified Lord by becoming a friend of this mediator in the form both of adoration and of petition.

We are familiar with this thought of vicarious suffering and death. We meet it everywhere in the New Testament. Let us here but note the ransom passage in Matt. 20: 28 and Mark 10: 45. The Evangelists express the excess of the love of Jesus, which is the standard of greatness in the kingdom of God, by His willingness to give His life as a redemption for many.

From this image of ransom money rises the word "redemption." It is used in the Acts of the Apostles (7: 35) to express the liberation of the Israelites from the slavery of Egypt. But elsewhere in the New Testament it means the Messianic liberation, redemption from the

[41] Rom. 8: 31 ff.

slavery of sin, by the sacrificial blood and death of Jesus.[42] At first sight we do not see that the term is connected directly with Jesus' use of the word "redemption." Rather it seems constantly to refer to the liberation of Christians by the blood of Christ as a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies. Similarly the "scandal of the cross" [43] was overcome by the Christians not merely by referring it to this liberation but above all by finding in it the fulfilment of Scripture.[44]

In his first letter to the Corinthians, St. Paul mentions as one of the chief elements of his instruction "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture." [45] Now every memory which Jewish Christians had of an expiatory sacrificial death would lead them again and again to the conception of sacrifice which they were familiar with from the Scriptures. Hence we need not wonder that there arose from this thought of the Messias suffering and dying not merely the expression "servant of God" but also the Old Testament image of the lamb that is led to the slaughter. The hearts of the disciples which burned within them when they read the Scriptures [46] led them to see in Jesus the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world.[47] In the fifty-third chapter of Isaias, which at an early period was interpreted by the Christians in a Messianic sense,[48] the two concep-

[42] Luke 21: 28; 24: 21; Eph. 4: 30; Col. 1: 14; I Tim 2: 6.
[43] Gal. 5: 11; I Cor. 1: 23.
[44] Matt. 26: 54; Luke 24: 26 f.; Acts 3: 18; 4: 28; 8: 3 ff.; I Pet. 2: 21 ff.
[45] I Cor. 15: 3.
[46] Luke 24: 32.
[47] John 1: 29, 36.
[48] Matt. 8: 17; Luke 22: 37; John 12: 38; Rom. 10: 16.

tions of lamb and expiation are already found united.[49] St. Peter paints very carefully and lovingly this appealing image of the lamb,[50] and likewise finds its fulfilment in Jesus.[51] And we may note in passing that the term "our pasch," used by St. Paul in the first letter to the Corinthians (5: 7), belongs to this same circle of ideas.

We know the reverence which the early Christians had for the written word of God [52] and the tradition according to which Jesus represented passages of Isaias and other passages of the Old Testament as fulfilled in Himself.[53] Thus the sacrificial ideas and the sacrificial ritual of the Old Testament influenced the development of the Christian liturgy. We find St. Peter telling the Christians that they have been redeemed with the blood more precious than that of the lamb of the Old Testament. "You are redeemed not with perishable silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." [54] This passage may illustrate the efforts of the early Christians to strengthen their belief in Jesus as the Messias dying on the cross for the salvation of the world by referring to Old Testament predictions, promises, persons, and events. Likewise we may understand how their own spiritual sense of the deeper meaning of their faith would be affected by these memories from the Old Testament sacrificial liturgy.

[49] Is. 53: 4, 11 f.
[50] I Pet. 1: 18 f.
[51] See also Acts 8: 32 ff.
[52] II Tim. 3: 16.
[53] Luke 4: 21.
[54] I Pet. 1: 18 f.

Jesus in the New Testament appears everywhere as the true antitype of the Old Testament expiatory sacrifice. By shedding His blood He, as the spotless and pure sacrifice, gained for men pardon and grace. God accepted Jesus "a propitiation by His blood." [55] This conception and similar effects of salvation guaranteed by the blood of Christ [56] allow us to see clearly the point of connection between the Jewish and the Hellenistic idea of sacrifice on the one hand, and the Christian idea on the other. To this general idea of the New Testament, Peter and John add the trait that Christ offered Himself as sacrifice. Lastly, St. Paul [57] represents Christ as a holocaust, an odor of sweetness unto God.

These conceptions become much clearer and much more appealing in their symbolism in the letter to the Hebrews and in the Apocalypse. And in both writings they are most closely associated with liturgical and sacrificial rites.

Let us summarize our main conclusions. The general idea of external sacrifice is a commonplace among men of antiquity. Among Christians, however, we find this additional trait, that their sacrifices and gifts are made, not merely to God directly, but are offered to Him by Christ and are accepted by Him through and from Christ.

We may also admit that Christian sacrifice and liturgy developed along the lines of Old Testament fulfilment. Hence we may give a general assent to the following

[55] Rom. 3: 25.
[56] Rom. 5: 9; I Cor. 10: 16; Eph. 1: 7; 2: 13; Col. 1: 20; I John 2: 2; 4: 10.
[57] Eph. 5: 2.

conclusion formulated by a student of the early Christian liturgy. "Christ came not to destroy the Law and the prophets, which, in their liturgical aspect, rested chiefly on the idea of sacrifice. Hence from this viewpoint Christ fulfilled the Law by His sacrifice on the cross, offered once for all to save the world, but also requiring a specific Christian sacrificial rite." [58] Evidently similar thoughts occupied the primitive Christians. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and so to enter into His glory?" [59] Yet, if we limit ourselves to the New Testament alone, we cannot offer a direct proof that would necessitate a specific Christian sacrifice merely as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies.

Lastly, we must not forget that the image of Jesus which the early Christians had in mind did not grow pale with time, but rather became ever brighter. Hence the Christians, who often did not easily follow theological exegesis,[60] occupied themselves in their assemblies rather with the striking images and popular parables which Jesus had left to console them. Frequent repetition would strengthen their memory of Him. Consequently in these community prayers of the early Christians their grateful remembrance of Jesus and their thought of His second coming to found His kingdom present us with a source from which we may expect to see Christian liturgy take its beginning.

From all these views and doctrines, memories and fulfilments, we see what powers existed in the life of

[58] Propst, *Liturgie der drei ersten Jahrhunderte,* 1870, p. 21.
[59] Luke 24: 46.
[60] II Pet. 3: 16.

faith among the early Christians, which would in time develop the Christian liturgy. It is a mistake to suppose that Christian liturgy arose only from non-Christian sources and influences or even principally from such sources and influences. Christian liturgy is a consequence of Christian thought. Yet we must not forget that Christian thought is connected intimately with its Jewish past and its Hellenistic environment. From this point of view the letter to the Hebrews deserves special study. The Apocalypse does indeed reveal in great detail the early Christian liturgy, but the wealth of images in that book presents difficulties in the penetration of the historical reality behind them. Hence we next take up the letter to the Hebrews, which speaks in great detail of liturgical matters, especially of Christ's priesthood and sacrifice.

CHAPTER XI

IMPORTANCE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS FOR EARLY CHRISTIAN LITURGY

THE following passage gives us most clearly the theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews. "Since, then, we have a great high priest who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold firmly to what we confess. For we have not a high priest who is unable to realize in Himself our weaknesses, but rather one who hath been tried in every way like ourselves, short of sin. Let us, therefore, approach with confidence to the throne of grace, so that we may receive mercy, and find grace to help us in due season. For every high priest taken from among men is appointed as a representative of men in the things that refer to God, that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sin; as one who can be mild with the ignorant and erring, since he himself is encompassed with weakness, and because of it must make offerings for sin, not merely on behalf of the people, but also for himself." [1]

The Epistle to the Hebrews reflects, indeed, certain Jewish Alexandrian conceptions. But it reveals likewise a very exact knowledge of the Old Testament and also

[1] Heb. 4: 14—5: 4.

many points of contact with the ideas of St. Paul. It is intended for discouraged Christians. It depicts before them the unique importance and greatness of Jesus Christ. What is most characteristic of the letter, which appears in the form of a treatise or an admonition (13: 22), is the idea of the heavenly high priesthood of Christ. This idea had so far not appeared in the New Testament. The Epistle is based on the thought that Christ is a merciful and true high priest before God to atone for the sins of the people (2: 17). Eleven times during the course of the Epistle the author repeats the expression, "the high priesthood of Jesus." [2]

The passage we quoted in the beginning shows that all characteristics of the high priest are to be found in Jesus. Nevertheless, however lofty this high priesthood of Jesus is, He is not a stranger to us, because He Himself was tempted as we are. His vocation like Aaron's is divine, and still He has sympathy with human miseries. His distinction from all other high priests is found in the truth that He is not a priest after the manner of Aaron, but according to the order of Melchisedech, the mysterious priest-king of Salem.[3] Hence in chapter 7 (vv. 1–3) we are made acquainted with the personality and significance of Melchisedech. In a method made familiar by rabbinical exegesis and Philo's Alexandrian theology, the author by uniting two passages [4] derives a number of parallels between the high priesthood of Melchisedech and that of Christ.

[2] Heb. 2: 17; 3: 1; 4: 14 f.; 5: 5, 10; 6: 20; 7: 26; 8: 1; 9: 11; 10: 21.
[3] Heb. 5: 10; Gen. 14: 18.
[4] Gen. 14: 17, 20 and Ps. 109: 4.

Melchisedech received tithes from Abraham and consequently from Levi, who still rested in the loins of Abraham. Hence Melchisedech gives the blessing to the father of the Jewish people and to the Levitical priesthood. But he who receives tithes and gives blessings is higher than the one who gives the tithes and receives the blessings.[5] The Levitical priesthood could not fulfil its purpose of leading the people to union with God. Consequently the Levitical priesthood passed away with the Mosaic Law, for "when the priesthood is changed, there taketh place also of necessity a change of the law" (7: 12). The inability of the Levitical priesthood to bring men into union with God showed the defectiveness of the Mosaic Law. This union with God was brought by Christ, who consequently in Ps. 109: 4 is presented as priest. He is not from the tribe of Levi, but from the tribe of Juda. He is a priest with an eternal priesthood.[6] He is established as priest by a divine oath.[7] Hence He remains forever, whereas Levitical priests, being mortal men, each died and was followed by others.[8] Lastly, Levitical priests, on account of their sins, had to offer daily sacrifice for themselves. Christ, in the order of Melchisedech, is free from sin, and offered one perfect sacrifice for all men and for all time.[9]

To show the perfection of the sacrifice of Christ, the author insists most emphatically on the place of sacrifice. In this truth he finds "the heart and substance of

[5] Heb. 7: 4 ff.
[6] Heb. 7: 11–19.
[7] Heb. 7: 20 ff.
[8] Heb. 7: 23 ff.
[9] Heb. 7: 26, 28.

what we have said" (8: 1). The Old Testament led its priests into the tabernacle. Christ performs His service in the heavenly sanctuary, at the right of the throne of glory, as liturgical minister of the true tabernacle, which the Lord, and not man, hath set up.[10] The earthly tabernacle was only a faint echo and image of the heavenly tabernacle. He who offered in the earthly tabernacle could not be mediator of the new order of grace promised in Jeremias.[11] This new order of grace brings true remission of sin and full knowledge of God and full union with God.[12] The Old Testament sacrifices, on the contrary, could bring about only an external union with God, signified by the furniture of the tabernacle and particularly by the inaccessibility of the holy of holies.[13]

The new and perfect union with God, the result of the sacrificial blood of Christ, is presented by the antithesis between the high priest of the Old Testament entering through the atrium and the sanctuary into the holy of holies, and the high priest of the New Testament entering through the heavens into the heavenly holy of holies, to find before the throne of God eternal reconciliation. "The blood of Christ, who through His eternal Spirit [14] hath offered Himself unblemished to God, will purify our conscience from dead works unto the service of the living God." [15] To this eternal sacri-

[10] Heb. 8: 1 ff.
[11] Jer. 31: 31 ff.
[12] Heb. 8: 6 ff.
[13] Heb. 9: 1 ff.
[14] This phrase, "through the eternal Spirit," is one of the sources of the epiklesis in the mass. Cf. Salaville, "Epiklèse eucharistique" in *Dict. théol. cath.*, V, 194–300.
[15] Heb. 9: 14.

fice of Christ which, in contrast to the Old Testament animal sacrifices, has everlasting value, we owe the inheritance of our eternal Sabbath.[16] Christ's death was necessary that we should enter into this inheritance, an inheritance which includes in itself the entire meaning of the New Testament, as becomes clear from the twofold meaning which the Greek word διαθήκη expresses. This word expresses both covenant and testament, and thus interprets the full meaning of the bloody sacrifices in the Old Law.[17]

We may conceive the Epistle to the Hebrews as originally a homily which was then sent out in the form of a letter to some friendly community. Thus we may best understand the author's sharp polemical tone against the Jewish liturgy, and against the Jewish Law, which is here treated from the ceremonial viewpoint as a sum of rules for sacrifice [18] and of priestly rights.[19] The Mosaic Law must pass away with its liturgy. It contained only carnal commandments (7: 16) and shadowy values (8: 5). The author contends against the Old Testament priesthood, against its place of worship, even against Moses, who is only a servant (3: 2–5).

Starting from this viewpoint, some scholars think the occasion of the epistle was the danger that certain Christian communities or groups might fall back into the accustomed splendor of Jewish liturgy and ritual solemnity. Now we cannot deny that possibly certain Christians clung with romantic enthusiasm to the privi-

[16] Heb. 3: 11—4: 12.
[17] Heb. 9: 11—10: 18.
[18] Heb. 8: 4; 9: 19, 22; 10: 8.
[19] Heb. 7: 5, 16, 28.

leges of the ancient religion. But since we cannot point out any definite occasion which might have led to sending this letter, and since the letter itself justifies only surmises about the character of the Christian liturgy at the time, we must beware of drawing unwarranted conclusions. The passages [20] which are generally quoted in favor of the hypothesis that it was addressed to Jewish Christians, may easily have been familiar also to Gentile Christians from their reading or hearing the Septuagint.

The real danger which stood before the eyes of the writer is not the fear that Christians may fall back into Judaism, but that they may fall away from faith altogether. His purpose was to encourage Christians who were suffering under persecution. He presents before them in shining colors the picture of Jesus Christ. He employs a method, familiar also to Gentile Christians, of allegorical exegesis in order to show them the splendor and solidity of the New Testament order of grace and the sureness of its promises. And he derives his arguments from the Old Testament, a book sacred to all Christians.

We must note that the author draws his arguments from the old Jewish liturgy, not from that which was practiced in the Temple of Jerusalem in his own time. This latter was probably known to many of his readers personally. The element that chiefly interests him in the Old Testament is its prophecies. These he employs to support the thesis that the Old Testament priesthood, sacrifice, and liturgy have meaning only as adum-

[20] Heb. 1: 1; 2: 16; 7: 27; 9: 15; 13: 12.

brations of Christian truth. In this sense the Epistle to the Hebrews is classical for the early Christian Church. The position occupied by the author of this letter is but the most emphatic instance of the early Christian practice to find the story of Jesus prophetically anticipated in the Old Testament.

We remark that in the life of Jesus we do not find the external and striking characteristics of the Messianic high priest expected by the time. Even in the Synoptic accounts, where He describes His own death as a death of expiation, He does not bring His death into explicit relation with the Old Testament priestly sacrifice. The other New Testament authors when they treat of the death of Jesus, which was to the Jews the greatest scandal, make it intelligible to their readers by seeing in it the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies, in particular the prophecy of the suffering servant of God.[21] In similar fashion the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews sees in the death of Jesus and in the blood which He shed the fulfilment of the prophecies concerning priesthood and sacrifice. Here the doctrine of the high priestly office of Christ is brought into explicit relation with the Jewish liturgy and the Old Testament priesthood. In interpreting Ps. 109: 4, Jewish authors find a glorification of the Israelitic priesthood. Our author proceeds from the same passage to show the imperfection of Aaron's high priesthood and the sublimity of Christ's high priesthood.

The author's idea of priesthood is that of mediation

[21] Is., chap. 53.

between the holiness of God and the sinfulness of man.[22] Consequently his idea of sacrifice is that of the sacrifice of reconciliation. For him priesthood without sacrifice is unthinkable. Consequently man can deal with God only by sacrifice, only by bloody sacrifice. The Old Testament sacrifices on which the author chiefly insists are those offered on the day of reconciliation [23] and the establishment of the covenant. But even these, being material [24] and typical,[25] cannot bring about true reconciliation with God. Only the sacrifice of Christ can bring about this true communion with God. In this sacrifice of Christ everything was fulfilled which can be demanded of a perfect sacrifice and a true high priest.[26]

Further we notice that Christ is simultaneously priest and victim [27] and thus could offer Himself to God as sacrifice. Christ is alone able to do this. We find here the thought of a spiritual worship combined with that of a sacrifice, that is, in the sense of giving blood and life. This union is possible because even in Christ's external sacrifice everything is spiritualized. Hence in Christ all the material external sacrifices of the Old Testament find their fulfilment.[28] "Only one who, by reason of this eternal spirit, had another life, an indestructible life, could thus offer His earthly bodily life

22 Heb. 5: 1; 12: 10; 12: 14.
23 Lev., chap. 16.
24 Σάρξ; Heb. 9: 10, 13.
25 Ὑπόδειγμα and σκιά; Heb. 8: 5.
26 Heb. 7: 23 f.; 10: 1–14.
27 Heb. 9: 14, 25; 10: 12.
28 Cf. Heb. 13: 20.

as a sacrifice, without thereby robbing Himself of the power to continue forever His priestly activity in the holy of holies." [29]

We have already noticed that this entrance of Christ the high priest with His blood into the holy of holies in heaven is the heart and substance of this letter to the Hebrews. This sacrifice in heaven is necessary for reconciliation with God.[30] Likewise it is necessary as purification for sinful man. This purification "cleanses his conscience from dead works to serve the living God." [31] We see here the specific meaning which the author assigns to the phrase "the glorified Lord." For him the phrase finds its fulfilment in the high priestly activity of Christ in heaven. In the death of Jesus he finds the fulfilment of the types of immolation in the Old Testament. The decisive element in the sacrifice of Christ is its value in the sight of God, just as the offering of the sacrificial blood in the holy of holies was the center and high point of the Old Testament idea of sacrifice.

The passages where the author expresses the culmination of his idea [32] remind us very much of the visions in the Apocalypse. All his argumentations drawn from so many disparate sources center at last in the entrance of the high priest by means of His blood into the heavenly sanctuary. Here He stands before the face of God in the innermost holy of holies. In heaven He offers those prayers of intercession by His blood of the

[29] Kluge, *Die Idee des Priestertums in Israel-Juda und im Urchristentum*, 1906.

[30] Heb. 2: 17; 9: 23.

[31] Heb. 9: 14.

[32] Heb. 2: 17; cf. 1: 3; 2: 9, 11.

New Testament.[33] The prayers He offers in heaven guarantee to His followers the eternal fruit of His sacrificial death.

We see here again a conception common to all ancient religions and emphasized particularly in the old Semitic religions, that blood it is which restores communion between God and men. This conception prevailed among the Christian converts, both the Jewish and the Gentile. The author of the letter is so deeply penetrated with this idea that even the intercessory prayer of the glorified Christ seems to him inconceivable without a sacrificial shedding of blood. Blood is the medium by which God is appeased. Likewise, as the symbol of life, it is the gift which Christ offers to God for men. His prayer in heaven, consequently, is the act of intercession whereby He moves God to accept this gift for the reconciliation of sinful man.

This conception, on the one hand, is in harmony with the texts we have already discussed, which speak of the blood of Christ as the means of reconciliation.[34] On the other hand, this conception is the fuller development of what other passages presuppose or contain only in germ. The letter to the Romans also speaks of a reconciliation performed by the glorified Christ.[35] But the letter to the Hebrews regards this intercession of Christ in the sense of an application of His bloody sacrifice in the interest of men. The author of the letter to the Hebrews cannot conceive piety divorced from sacrifice,

[33] Heb. 9: 20; 10: 29; 13: 20.

[34] Acts 20: 28; Rom. 5: 9; Eph. 1: 7; 2: 13; Col. 1: 20; I Pet. 1: 19; I John 1: 7; Apoc. 1: 5; 5: 9.

[35] Rom. 8: 34.

prayer and liturgy without sacrifice. Without sacrificial blood there is no entrance to God.

In the tenth chapter the author returns to his tone of admonition. He exhorts his hearers to remain faithful to the salvation which the great high priest over the house of God has prepared for us. He further exhorts them not to regard as profane the blood of the covenant (10: 29), but "to approach unto Mount Sion, and the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to the myriads of angels, to the festal gathering and assemblage of the first-born registered in heaven, to God the judge of all, to the spirits of the just made perfect, to Jesus the Mediator of the New Testament, and to that blood of sprinkling which speaketh better than that of Abel." [36]

In the thirteenth chapter he enters into a series of warnings. "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today, yea, and forever. Do not be led away by manifold and strange teachings, for it is good that the heart be made firm by grace and not by foods, from which they had no profit who occupied themselves therein. We have an altar from which they are not entitled to eat who serve the tabernacle." [37]

If we study the context here, we will find difficulty in agreeing with those exegetes who explain "altar" in this passage as referring directly to the Eucharistic table. In the passage we are now studying, "altar" must mean the fulfilment by Christ of the Old Testament

[36] Heb. 12: 22–25.
[37] Heb. 13: 8 ff.

rite on the great day of reconciliation. The word "altar" here means Christ, the true high priest, and His sacrifice on the cross. If we compare this passage with similar ones in Romans, II Corinthians, and Ephesians, we cannot doubt the author is exhorting his readers to remain true to the eternally unchangeable Lord. Gather round the altar of our sacrifice of reconciliation, in which you all have a share, but of which those who serve the tabernacle may not eat.

Hence in this passage "altar" must mean the place where Christ offered Himself as sacrifice.[38] Christ is antitype of the Old Testament sacrifice on the great day of reconciliation. Hence He suffered outside the gate. Hence we in order to reach Him must go outside the camp. The author's conclusion is that the sacrificial death of Christ fulfils and makes true what the Old Testament sacrifice on the day of reconciliation typified.

This passage shows clearly what importance the author ascribes to the Old Testament ritual prescriptions. They are for him the necessary presuppositions of the consummate perfection of the New Testament sacrificial priesthood of Jesus. His argument rests on his conviction that the ritual performed in the tabernacle is of divine origin. For the priests, it is true, the Levitical priests, who could not bring the people to perfection, he has only the word "servants of the tabernacle." By this phrase he reminds his hearers that the earthly tabernacle, with all that belongs to it, is only a pale imperfect copy of the heavenly sanctuary. Into this heavenly

[38] Heb. 7: 27; 9: 14, 26, 28.

sanctuary Christ alone, the high priest of the New Testament, can enter by way of His altar of the cross in order to reconcile and perfect His people.

The author of the Epistle notes this truth by saying that the Old Testament priests served the tabernacle; he does not say that they served in the tabernacle. These priests, just as they were excluded from immediate participation even in the Old Testament holocausts, since the victims themselves were burned, so still more as long as they served the tabernacle are they excluded from eating of the Christian altar. They are excluded from the reconciling sacrifice of Christ by the fact that He shed His sacrificial blood on the cross outside the gates of the city. Only those can approach God [39] and serve God [40] who profit by the free access to Him which the high priestly act of Jesus has created.

The sacrificial actions of the Old Testament "were incapable of perfecting in conscience him that worships." [41] Likewise "the mere fleshly ordinances imposed until a time of reformation" bring about a merely Levitical bodily purification.[42] The sacrifice of Jesus, on the contrary, having all the conditions of a true reconciling sacrifice,[43] has the power to free each worshiper, to free the whole people, from all guilt. Hence Christians trust not to insufficient sacrifices, to food and drink and other material things, but only to Him who is both true sacrifice and true high priest and

[39] Heb. 4: 16; 7: 19, 25.
[40] Heb. 9: 14; 12: 18.
[41] Heb. 9: 9.
[42] Heb. 9: 10 ff.
[43] Heb. 13: 11 f.

who is consequently our altar.[44] Through Him we have access to God, to whom we offer our sacrifices of praise, the fruit of our lips. Through Him we praise God for the true and eternal reconciliation we have received in Christ Jesus (v. 15), who remains the selfsame yesterday, today, and forever (v. 8).

What most strikingly emerges from this lengthy presentation of the doctrine in the Epistle to the Hebrews is the primitive Christian conception that sacrifice is an essential element of our relation to God. The author's argumentation presupposes hearers who have this conception. For his readers as for himself, reconciliation with God is "the most clear and certain persuasion in the world." [45] Common likewise to himself and to his readers is the prophetic importance assigned to the Old Testament. Both writer and readers see in the life of Jesus the fulfilment of the word spoken of Him centuries before in the Old Testament. Prophecy and fulfilment reciprocally influenced their thoughts and deeds, their faith and their life. They find as self-evident the endeavor to see the death of the Messias in the light of the traditional sacrificial system. This attitude of mind governs them not only in their private thoughts and memories, but especially at their gatherings. We have seen what importance the author assigns to these community assemblies.[46] That these meetings were liturgical in character is evident from all the sources that treat of them.

[44] Heb. 13: 10. Cf. *Altare enim ipse Christus est* (allocution of ordaining bishop to candidate for subdeaconship). Tr.

[45] Hans Windisch, *Der Hebräerbrief,* 1913, pp. 78 f.

[46] Heb. 10: 25.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who takes a stand against the merely material liturgical prescriptions of the Old Law, does not on that account abandon the line of thought which we have seen in the teaching of our Lord and of St. Paul.[47] Our author, too, maintains the spirituality of Christian worship. But for him the external sacrifice of Christ becomes a spiritual sacrifice made possible and actual by the eternal Spirit. Since he knows no other sacrifice than the one sacrifice of Christ, offered once for all, he can proceed to urge Christians to offer the sacrifice also of praise, and the spiritual worship of good deeds and almsgiving. "Because in such sacrifices God is well pleased" (13: 16).

What our author says of the importance of faith as the expectation of salvation (11: 12), strengthens the conclusion we have just drawn. The Old Testament, in his eyes, has little value when looked at in its liturgy and priesthood, but very great value in its lofty spirit of faith. "Without faith it is impossible to please God: for he that approacheth unto God must believe that He doth exist, and is rewarder to those who seek Him" (11: 6). But the conclusion which the author draws from these presuppositions is limited entirely to the sacrifices of the Old Testament. In another passage[48] we read: "Through Him, therefore, let us at all times offer sacrifice of praise to God, that is the truth of lips that praise His name. And forget not kindness and fellowship, for in such sacrifices God taketh pleasure." But

[47] Rom. 12: 1.
[48] Heb. 13: 15 f.

neither of these passages justifies the conclusion that the author is advocating a piety devoid of sacrifice.

In his mind the sacrifice of Christ takes the place of all the Old Testament sacrifices. But he is firmly persuaded and presupposes readers who share his persuasion, that sacrifice with shedding of blood is an essential element in man's approach to God and that consequently Christians cannot have union with God except through the sacrificial blood of Christ. Only Christ's blood opens the entrance into the sanctuary through the veil, which is His flesh. Hence he urges his readers to enter in with sincere hearts and the full certitude of faith.[49] And he concludes by saying that one who sins after knowing this truth and has thus profaned the blood of the covenant by which he had been sanctified, has no longer hope of salvation.[50]

The tone of our author differs from that of the other New Testament writers, especially from that of St. John. He does not emphasize as they do the inward mystic spiritual union with the glorified Lord or the inward preoccupation of their thoughts with the days of our Lord's earthly existence, or their union with Him in faith and love. Hence we may admit that his emphasis on the sacrificial blood of Jesus and his eschatological hope are not as effective a background as theirs is for the spiritual worship consisting in moral Christian life. He insists exclusively on the idea of the high priest active in the heavenly sanctuary. He develops his thesis

[49] Heb. 10: 19, 26.
[50] Heb. 10: 26 ff.

exclusively from the parallelism between priest and sacrifice of the Old Testament and the piety based on the vision of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary. Thus he cannot, as they do, insist so directly on daily Christian life as an essential element of sacrifice. For we must notice that Jesus Himself, in preaching the kingdom of God and preannouncing His death, does not explicitly connect these truths with the sacrificial conceptions of the Old Testament. The only events in the earthly life of our Lord which our author directly mentions are that He suffered outside the gates of the city and that He prayed with strong cry and tears to be preserved from death (5: 7).

On the other hand, we are unable to read the Epistle to the Hebrews with its insistence on the traditional conception of sacrifice and on the necessary connection between sacrifices of blood and reconciliation and on the fulfilment of all these anticipations in Christ, unless we go further and conclude that there existed among Christians some special act of worship which made Christ in some real sense present by an act of sacrifice. This conclusion is strengthened by what we have already said about primitive Christian conceptions of the glorified Lord and other Christian lines of thought. In other words, we must admit specific liturgical elements in early Christian times, particularly in the form of the banquet in common.

PART II

GENESIS OF THE CHRISTIAN LITURGY

CHAPTER XII

PRAYER IN COMMON

IN GENERAL

THE Christian characteristic most emphasized in the New Testament is union and fellowship with the glorified Lord and with one another. It finds probably its most pregnant expression in the Epistle to the Galatians. "In Him is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." [1] "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but faith working through charity." [2] But already in the Acts of the Apostles this spirit of union and fellowship is so stressed and glorified [3] that we are reminded of the solemn language of a liturgical hymn.[4] And this certainty which Christians have of belonging together in Christ expresses itself likewise in an external local union. The two elements, the internal and the external, are often mentioned together. Thus the phrases, "union

[1] Gal. 3: 28.
[2] Gal. 5: 6; cf. I Cor. 12: 13; Eph. 2: 11 f.; Col. 3: 11; John 10: 16.
[3] Acts 2: 44 ff.
[4] Cf. Eph. 4: 11 ff.

and fellowship" and "with one mind and heart," become words of endearment in primitive Christian language. Christians have been called by God to union and fellowship with His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, and consequently form one society with God and with one another.[5]

Coming to the question of specific elements in this union and fellowship, we find first their union in common prayer.[6] The second element that appears is their mutual support by gifts of beneficence. Thus we come to the third element wherein the word "union" expresses the collections made for needy fellow Christians.[7] At the beginning this union and fellowship was a consequence of the fact that the Apostles continued the life in common which they had begun in the company of Jesus.[8] As might be expected, the first disciples joined them in their manner of life, a phenomenon which is not surprising during the time when the Apostles were waiting for the coming of the Spirit.[9] If, therefore, the religious character of union and fellowship stands thus revealed at the very root, we are not surprised when we find that this spirit results in religious instruction, in breaking of bread, and in prayer, all in common.

Elsewhere also in the Acts of the Apostles this union and fellowship which distinguishes Christians finds clear expression. "And when they had entered, they

[5] I Cor. 1: 9; 10: 16; Gal. 2: 9; Phil. 1: 5; Philem. 6: I John 1: 3, 6 f.
[6] Acts 1: 14, 2: 1, 42, 46; 4: 24; 5: 12; 15: 25; Rom. 15: 6.
[7] Rom. 15: 26; II Cor. 9: 13; cf. Heb. 13: 16.
[8] Matt. 19: 27.
[9] Acts 1: 4 ff., 13–15; 2: 1, 44 ff.

mounted to the upper room where they remained together." [10] "And when the day of Pentecost was come, they were all gathered together into one place." [11] "They persevered in the teaching of the Apostles and fellowship, the breaking of the bread, and the prayers." [12] In all these texts we see clearly that the idea of union and fellowship includes not merely local union, but one that is inward and spiritual, based on their union in faith and life. If we remember further that in many passages [13] the persons spoken of include the newly converted Christians, we are not surprised that perseverance in the new community is emphasized.

We can see the idea of fellowship and union likewise in the episode of Ananias and Saphira.[14] The passage, indeed, offers many riddles to the exegete. But this much is clear, that the background of the story is a sense of union and fellowship expressing itself in its local meetings.

The place implied in all the passages so far quoted is the upper room of a private house, in all likelihood that same room where Jesus had held the last meal with His disciples. But in 5: 12, the place mentioned is Solomon's Porch in the Temple. But again from chapter 12, the place mentioned is a private house.[15] A similar locality is implied in many forms of greeting in the epistles of the Apostles. But in all these passages we see

[10] Acts 1: 13.
[11] Acts 2: 1.
[12] Acts 2: 42.
[13] Acts 2: 42, 46.
[14] Acts 5: 1–11.
[15] Cf. 9: 11, 17 f.; 10: 48; Acts 12: 12.

how the new life of faith led Christians to hold their meetings apart by themselves. "Of the rest, no one dared to cleave to them." [16]

In 12: 12 we see an especially clear expression of the development of this spirit of union and fellowship. This union and fellowship, being of purely religious origin, found its most beautiful development in religious functions, in common liturgical worship. Thus this spirit of union prepared the way for liturgical assemblies in the strict sense of the word. From their constant practice of associating together in those first days, there remained as a final development the custom of coming together also for the liturgy. In this liturgical sense St. Paul speaks of Christians as "coming together." [17] Many passages in the Acts of the Apostles also speak of the custom which led Christians to "gather together." [18]

The phrase "with one heart and soul" is, like the phrase "union and fellowship," frequent in the Acts of the Apostles. And this phrase leads us to liturgical assemblies in the full sense of the word. We need only compare the passages in which the phrase occurs.[19] The language in 2: 46 is especially significant. The young community gathers with one accord in the Temple. Likewise with one accord they break bread in private houses and take food with joyful simplicity of heart, praising God. In all these passages the note of union and fellowship is so emphatic that we need no proof to hold

[16] Acts 5: 13.
[17] I Cor. 5: 4 f.; 11: 20; 14: 23.
[18] Acts 11: 26; 20: 7.
[19] Acts 2: 46; 4: 24; 5: 12; 8: 6; 12: 20; 15: 25; 18: 12; 19: 29.

that the prayers and hymns here mentioned are said and sung in common. That the early Christians prayed in common is thus made evident by their own religious documents, so that we have no need to refer in this connection either to their Jewish inheritance or to the widespread practice of prayer and its importance in life among the common people in the Hellenistic age. Our problem is merely to gather the different elements that underlie this truth.

The first prayer in common recorded in the Acts is found in chapter 4. When the Apostles returned from the Sanhedrin to their fellow Christians and had given an account of their experience, then all in unison lifted up their voice to God and said: 'O Lord, Thou art He who didst make the heaven and the earth and the sea and all things therein, who didst say through the Holy Spirit by the mouth of our father David thy servant,

> Why have the Gentiles raged
> and the peoples devised vain things?
> The kings of the earth took their stand
> and the rulers gathered together
> against the Lord and against His Christ.

For of a truth were gathered together in this city against Thy holy servant Jesus, whom Thou hadst anointed, Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel, to do whatsoever Thy hand and counsel had predestined to befall. And now, Lord, look upon their threats, and grant Thy servants to speak Thy word with all boldness, stretching out Thy hand

to work healing and signs and wonders through the name of thy holy servant Jesus." [20]

In this prayer we notice that it is not a prayer of thanksgiving for the deliverance of the Apostles, but is rather a petition for divine support in their Apostolic labors. We notice further that they apply to themselves, just as they do in the case of Jesus, the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies. Further, the invocation of God as Lord and Creator corresponds directly to Jewish rather than to Christian sentiment. Strongly emphasized is the petition for signs and wonders. These signs and wonders as elsewhere in the New Testament [21] are here regarded as necessary equipment for the Apostle and missioner. Lastly, we notice the strong confidence in God that is expressed in the passage and the persuasion that everything rests in His counsel and in His hand.

The spirit of confidence which is associated with Old Testament prayers rests on the promises made to the fathers. Hence this prayer of the assembled Christian community does not have directly the appeal to the Father so emphasized in the prayers of Jesus. Their confidence rests rather on their sense of community in that act of salvation which Christ has made possible. Hence this prayer differs from the usual Jewish prayer only by its conclusion, where the Apostles and disciples call upon the name of Jesus, the holy servant of God.

In the Acts of the Apostles no other prayers made in common are given verbatim. There is possibly one ex-

[20] Acts 4: 23 ff.
[21] Acts 3: 12; 8: 6; 14: 3; Rom. 15: 18; I Cor. 12: 11.

ception, the prayer pronounced in the choosing of Matthias as Apostle, though some scholars consider the words there given as being a literary elaboration and not the exact words used on that occasion. Further, we find such prayers in their exact wording nowhere in the New Testament. Prayers, indeed, made by an individual, we find in the case of Simeon in the Temple, in the prayer of the Pharisee and the publican, in the petition of the dying thief, and in the last prayer of St. Stephen.[22]

There is a remarkable parallel between the prayer of the faithful at Jerusalem after the deliverance of St. Peter from prison and the account given in Acts of the prayer offered by the community in Tyre when it was taking leave of St. Paul on the eve of his dangerous visit to Jerusalem. With wives and children they accompanied him to the shore and there "they all knelt down on the sand and prayed." [23] And this scene itself is similar to the one at Miletus, where the Apostle in leaving the disciples "knelt down and prayed with all of them." [24] And in 12: 5 we have another instance of the community praying for St. Peter. When the Apostle was again taken prisoner, the community gathered together and prayed for him without ceasing.

The passages quoted furnish us with illustrations and not with exceptions. In every epistle of St. Paul we may find parallels. In none of his letters does he fail to assure the community of his own intercessory prayers and

[22] Acts 7: 59 f.
[23] Acts 21: 5.
[24] Acts 20: 36.

to commend himself to theirs in turn.[25] He urges his hearers to continued prayer for all the saints.[26] In the public assemblies he allows each participant to say a prayer.[27] Hence we see not only that the private life of Christians was dominated by the spirit of prayer [28] but that also in their public assemblies they obeyed the injunction to praise with one heart and with one tongue God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.[29]

We are justified in going a step farther. When we find St. Paul introducing and ending each epistle with a blessing or prayer, we may see in this practice a reflection of the universal Christian custom to begin and end each assembly with prayer. This practice in the beginning may have been the spontaneous expression of a community of souls all borne aloft by the same religious enthusiasm. It may have been in the beginning a gift of the Spirit, a charisma.[30] But little by little the practice came to be an accepted duty, one of the integral elements that entered into all their assemblies.

This truth appears in the passage we have already mentioned.[31] It appears again in St. Paul's words, "we cry Abba, Father." [32] It appears in a remark made by the Apostles [33] that one of their reasons for deciding upon the ordination of deacons was that they might de-

[25] See, e. g., Rom. 1: 11 f.; 15: 30; II Cor. 1: 11; Eph. 6: 19; I Thess. 5: 25; II Thess. 3: 1.
[26] Eph. 6: 18.
[27] I Cor. 14: 16.
[28] Rom. 12: 12; Phil. 4: 6; I Thess. 5: 17; I Peter 4: 7.
[29] Rom. 15: 6.
[30] Rom. 8: 26.
[31] I Cor. 14: 16.
[32] Rom. 8: 15.
[33] Acts 6: 4.

vote themselves to prayer. The same truth appears in I Tim. 2: 1–15, where the text mentions petitions, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings. We should not insist on a sharp division between these four classes, since in the Greek text they are introduced without any article, and since the emphasis seems rather to be that all ranks of men are included. This emphasis appears in the words which urge us to pray "on behalf of kings, and all who are in high station, in order that we may pass a quiet and peaceful life in all piety and reverence." [34] This prayer for rulers is characteristic of the most ancient Christianity. We find also instances of prayer for other classes. Thus St. James exhorts to prayer for the sick (5: 14), and St. John (5: 16) to pray for sinners.

We have already considered that the Christians' prayers extended to all classes. We must now consider passages which show that Christians clearly distinguished different kinds of prayer. In Eph. 5: 19 and Col. 3: 16 we have the words "psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles" as names for the different kinds of song connected with their prayers. We have further a variety of verbs as, for instance, "to bless, to thank, to sing hymns,[35] to praise,[36] to beseech,[37] to honor." [38]

These terms, we notice, are not original in the New Testament. They are traditional in the Jewish liturgy. Nor can we show that each term includes a specific kind

[34] I Tim. 2: 2.
[35] Matt. 26: 26, 27, 30 and parallels.
[36] Luke 2: 13, 20; 19: 37; Rom. 15: 11.
[37] Mark 11: 24; Luke 11: 9 ff.; Jas. 1: 5 f.; 4: 3.
[38] John 5: 23.

of prayer or praise. But certain specific classes of prayer are distinguished in the New Testament. Such are Old Testament psalms, other biblical canticles, songs and hymns modeled on them, prayers of petition, adoration, and thanksgiving. Details will be given later.

Did the Christians have special hours of prayer? The answer is that they did. Not merely did they observe the traditional hours of Jewish prayer, but they had their own distinctive Christian hours. This fact is clear from the concluding phrase of the following verse in the Acts of the Apostles (2: 42): "They persevered in the teaching of the Apostles and fellowship, the breaking of the bread, and the prayers." Let us notice in verse 47 of the same chapter the phrase "praising God," which grammatically is a parallel with the phrase quoted above. Further, in that same verse 47, we see the characteristic note: "They took food with joyful simplicity of heart."

We may now trace the steps of development that led to the situation we have already described in I Tim. 2: 1–15. These are the steps. One of the Apostles or prophets would begin a God-inspired prayer, to which the brethren would answer with a common "Amen." Then a second brother, who felt himself prompted thereto by the Spirit, would express his heart in vocal prayer. His petition, too, would be concluded by the community, either in the form of the traditional doxology of the synagogue or in some similar formula [39] or at least with a confirmatory "Amen." This truth is well illustrated in I Cor. 14: 16. St. Paul here speaking of a

[39] I Cor. 12: 13.

participant who is not in ecstasy, who is possibly but a catechumen, says that such a one may participate in the liturgy by speaking the "Amen." [40]

We may notice a development here also in the thought and practice of St. Paul himself. In I Thess. 5: 19 he tells his readers not to extinguish the spirit. This passage shows that at this time he was still opposed to excessive restraint of enthusiasm. But soon he came to see the necessity of cultivating the community feeling in public prayer. Consequently he lays down restrictions on personal freedom, spiritual enthusiasm.[41] Thus he is responsible for the insistence in liturgical prayer upon conformity to established public order as opposed to individual expression of spirituality.

PRAYER TO THE FATHER

We have already noted St. Paul's teaching [42] that Christians should call on God by the Aramaic word "Abba," which means "Father." He adds, as a reason for this title, that "God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts." From this passage we see that the Christian community was imitating the example of Jesus. As that Christian community was penetrated by its thought of its adoptive sonship, it found prayer to God the Father a most natural practice.

We find no explicit mention of the use of the Our Father by the early Christians. But single petitions of

[40] See also, e. g., Rom. 1: 25; 9: 5; 11: 36.
[41] I Cor. 14: 26–40.
[42] Gal. 4: 6.

this prayer do appear elsewhere in the New Testament, even outside the Gospels. Let us note further that the *Didache,* almost contemporary with some New Testament writings, has the Our Father almost in the exact liturgical form handed down to us by St. Matthew. Historical investigation reveals the harmony between primitive Christian prayers and the prayers recorded as pronounced by Jesus Himself. This harmony is the standard by which we distinguish specific Christian prayers from Jewish or pagan prayers.

The first prayer recorded as recited by the community [43] does not address God as "Father." We must add that in the Acts,[44] in the passages where God is called "Father," the term refers to God as the Father of our Lord, not as the Father of all the faithful. Hence we recognize the importance of the passage in Galatians which emphasizes the Christian custom of calling God in prayer by the name of Father. Here we have preserved a fundamental thought of the Gospel as preached by Jesus. The passage in Galatians, as contrasted with the passage in the Acts, where the word "Father" does not occur, shows that Christians soon came to regard the term "the spirit of sonship" as expressing not merely the spirit of Jesus, but the spirit of all Christians. All this is contained in the identification of the word "Abba" with the word "Father."

But is this custom of calling God by the name of Father a characteristic Christian custom? We may, indeed, find occasional instances in pre-Christian times.

[43] Acts 4: 24 ff.
[44] 1: 4, 7; 2: 33.

We may even admit with Baumstark,[45] that Jewish praise of God being in prose is in opposition to Hellenistic praise of God in the form of hymns. We likewise admit that the invocation of God as Father is a traditional Jewish form of prayer. But with all this we must still insist that the invocation of God by the name "Father" is characteristic of the relation between Jesus and God, and between Christians and God. So characteristic is this conception that Christianity in speaking Greek retained the primitive Aramaic form "Abba" which had been used by Christ Himself.[46] And Paul himself, whose mentality was Jewish, regarded this Aramaic word as something that was characteristic of Christianity. "Hence we are justified in claiming this invocation as a possession of the most ancient Christian literature and indirectly as belonging to our Lord's habitual way of speaking." [47]

St. Paul himself, who preserves this primitive Christian invocation, is likewise the typical example to show how and why the Christian in prayer called on God as his Father. In the strictest sense of the word, God is Father only of Jesus. But through Jesus, God is Father also of Christians.[48] To Christians is the promise made, "I will be to you a Father, and you shall be to Me sons and daughters." [49] Hence we find that God is called either "the God and Father," [50] or simply "the Fa-

[45] Baumstark, *Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie,* 1923, p. 93.
[46] Mark 14: 36; Rom. 8: 15; Gal. 4: 6.
[47] Von der Goltz, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit,* 1901, p. 12.
[48] Rom. 15: 6; I Cor. 15: 24; II Cor. 6: 18.
[49] II Cor. 6: 18.
[50] Gal. 1: 4; Eph. 5: 20; Phil. 4: 20; I Thess. 1: 3; 3: 11, 13.

ther." [51] Christians call Him "our Father." [52] Christians in their prayers imitate St. Paul, who calls God by this name in the introductions to nearly all of his letters. Lastly, they speak to Him in petition or thanksgiving by calling Him "our God and Father." [53]

But none of the passages just cited equals the profundity of that phrase "Abba, Father" which springs up from the depths of the Christian spirit. This invocation, used by Jesus Himself and pronounced after Him by all Christians, gives full meaning to the introduction of the Our Father as recorded by St. Luke: "when you pray say Father." [54]

We may justly argue that the practice insisted on by St. Paul, who never uses the name "Father" when speaking of mankind before the time of Christ or outside Christianity, shows that Christians did understand all the petitions of the Our Father as being specifically Christian. And on this truth we must insist though all these petitions have parallels in the Old Testament and are closely related, especially as recorded by St. Matthew, with official Jewish prayers and might also be spoken by non-Christians.

When we are looking for parallels to the petitions of the Our Father, we must use much care. Many New Testament passages, instead of being such parallels, may be echoes of the Old Testament, which often has similar texts, though generally in the form not of petition, but of promise, assurance, or commandment. If we wish to

[51] Thirty-five times. Thus Past, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, 1902, p. 156.
[52] Rom. 1: 7; I Cor. 1: 3; II Cor. 1: 2; Gal. 1: 4; Phil. 1: 2; Philem. 3.
[53] Phil. 4: 20; I Thess. 1: 3; 3: 11.
[54] Luke 11: 2.

establish these New Testament passages as direct citations or echoes of the Our Father, we must find in them the specific Christian stamp. With this restriction, let us examine the following passages.

The first petition is, "hallowed be Thy name." In Jewish ears this petition is a solemn expression of that glorification of God which proceeds from God Himself. The petition is paralleled by the phrase of St. John (10: 36) which says that God sanctifies (hallows) Christ. Another parallel is the word of St. Paul,[55] which says that God sanctifies Christians. Further, St. John puts on the lips of Jesus the words, "Father, glorify Thy name." [56] To understand the force of this passage, we must note that St. John often puts the two verbs "sanctify" and "glorify" in juxtaposition. Likewise we should note that according to Greek exegesis the word "hallow" in this first petition means "glorify."

The second petition of the Our Father is, "Thy kingdom come." In exactly these words we do not find it elsewhere in the New Testament. But the "Our Father from beginning to end cannot be understood correctly except in relation to the Messianic hopes of Israel." [57] Hence we may find parallels with all its petitions in those prayers which are inspired by the expectation of the Parousia or by eschatological considerations. All these prayers beg for the coming of the Lord and of His gifts. The word "kingdom" expresses the kingdom as a gift coming from God.[58] The corresponding

[55] I Thess. 5: 23; cf. I Cor. 1: 2; I Thess. 4: 3.
[56] John 12: 28; cf. Apoc. 15: 4.
[57] Bindemann, *Das Gebet um tägliche Vergebung der Sünden,* 1902, p. 28.
[58] Matt. 25: 34; Luke 12: 32; 22: 29; Heb. 12: 28.

prayer of primitive Christianity directed to the glorified Lord is "maranatha." [59]

We note a wider meaning assigned to the word "kingdom of God." Sometimes this meaning is so wide that it includes all Christian preaching.[60] But possibly for that very reason the word "kingdom" in these passages does not have the meaning it has in the Gospels, namely, with a connotation that implies only the coming of the kingdom in the immediate present. The passages in the Acts conceive the meaning of the phrase in a different sense, which looks to the power proceeding from Jesus, the glorified Lord. The announcement that the kingdom of heaven is near, that Jesus is the Messias, that He is the King and bearer of this kingdom, is the primitive Christian announcement. In this sense Christianity prayed for His second coming, prayed for His kingdom, which they identified with the kingdom of God that had been preached by Christ Himself. More and more they conceived this kingdom as something not yet here and now, but something that is to come.[61]

The third petition of the Our Father is "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." We recall the three thoughts: Father, Thy kingdom, Thy will. That the will of God be done remains the permanent disposition of Christianity at prayer. The word in St. James (4: 15), "if the Lord will," may be a phrase familiar in ancient correspondence. But that Christians endeavored even in the smallest details of daily life earnestly to fulfil

[59] I Cor. 16: 22; Apoc. 22: 20.

[60] Acts 1: 3; 8: 12; 19: 8; 20: 25; 28: 30 f.

[61] Matt. 19: 28; 25: 34; Luke 22: 29 f.; John 18: 36 f.; I Cor. 6: 9 f.; Gal. 5: 21; II Tim. 4: 1.

God's will, is evident from St. Paul's use of the same phrase in I Cor. 4: 19, "I will come to you shortly if the Lord will." Hence we may be sure that this formula has a place in their prayers.[62] And we would be sure of this even if we did not have an account of the following incident in the life of St. Paul. On leaving the house of Philip in Caesarea, when Agabus and the others had urged him not to go up to Jerusalem, Paul answered: " 'What are ye doing, thus weeping and breaking my heart? I am ready not only to be bound, but to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus.' So when he would not be persuaded, we ceased and said: 'The Lord's will be done.' " [63] The conclusion of this passage shows that in the minds of Christians the word "Lord" signified Jesus, as in the Old Testament it signified God.

Passing by the fourth and fifth petitions, which have no verbatim parallels in the New Testament, we come to the sixth petition, "and lead us not into temptation." To this petition we have perhaps a parallel in I Cor. 10: 13: "Temptation hath not come upon you but such as man can bear; and God is faithful, and will not suffer you to be tempted beyond your strength, but will make with temptation issue, that ye may be able to bear it." We note that the word "temptation" has here the same meaning as it has in the Lord's Prayer.[64] We note likewise that in both passages we have the contrasting conjunctions "and" and "but."

[62] Cf. Rom. 1: 10.
[63] Acts 21: 13 f.
[64] Matt. 6: 13.

The seventh petition is, "but deliver us from the evil one." We have very probably a parallel in II Tim. 4: 18, "The Lord hath delivered me from every evil work." At first, indeed, we might think this passage lies under the influence of Ps. 21: 20–22: "But Thou, O Lord, remove not Thy help to a distance from me; look toward my defense. Deliver, O God, my soul from the sword: my only one from the hand of the dog. Save me from the lion's mouth; and my lowness from the horns of the unicorns." The phrase "from every evil work" leads rather to the Our Father than to the psalm. The doxology in the passage from Timothy points likewise rather to the well-known solemn conclusion of the Our Father as adopted in the liturgy.[65]

Two other echoes of the Our Father are recognizable. The first is in II Thess. 3: 1–3: "For the rest, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified even as among you, and that we may be delivered from the troublesome and the wicked. For not all have the faith. Yet faithful is the Lord, who shall establish you and guard you from the evil one." The second is from Col. 1: 13 f.: "Yea, He hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath transferred us to the kingdom of His beloved Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins." [66]

PRAYER IN THE NAME OF JESUS

Primitive Christianity accepted full-heartedly the mediation of Jesus with God. Hence we may expect to

[65] Cf. *Didache*, chap. 8.
[66] Cf. John 17: 15; Eph. 4: 32.

find reflections of this belief in their liturgical life. To this expectation correspond ever so many passages which call on God "in Christ," "through Christ," and "in the name of Christ."

As far as the Synoptic Gospels come into question, we find the position of Christ as mediator in all those passages which show that the person of Jesus is required for attaining to God. The same truth emerges from those passages where Jesus Himself demands faith in His person as a condition on the part of those who pray to Him.

But St. John is our most eloquent witness for the practice of praying in the name of Jesus. The Evangelist expresses in the clearest words the truth that Christians have in their Lord not only a sure way, but the only way, to the Father (14: 6). Hence even in prayer they cannot reach God except through Jesus. To understand the force of the following passages, let us note that in the Greek text the word for "ask" is never used by Jesus of His own prayers to the Father, but only of the prayers of His disciples, either to Himself or to the Father. The passages are these: "Whatsoever ye shall ask in My name, that will I do, in order that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye ask Me anything in My name, I will do it (14: 13 f.); I have chosen you . . . that whatsoever ye ask the Father in My name, He may do it to you (15: 16). Amen, amen I say to you, if ye ask the Father anything, He will give it to you in My name. . . . In that day ye shall ask in My name, and I say not to you that I shall ask the Father for you" (16: 24, 26).

When we consider these passages from the farewell discourse of Jesus, we find the conclusion very probable that the Evangelist chose these phrases because the Christian communities of his time did as a matter of fact invoke the name of Jesus in their prayers. Hence we need not recur to the ancient belief which found the might of the Divinity expressed in the name of the Divinity. Neither need we recur to the Jewish custom expressed in the rabbinic axiom, "His name is He, and He is His name." [67] We need merely note that the primitive Christian custom of invoking the name of Jesus on the most diverse occasions, particularly in connection with miraculous cures, is a conclusion admitted by all scholars.[68] St. John himself supposes the existence of that custom as we see in the very first passage in which he uses the phrase, "ask in My name." "Whatsoever ye shall ask in My name, that will I do, in order that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye ask Me anything in My name, I will do it" (14: 13 f.). We must note that immediately before this passage occur the words, "Amen, amen I say to you, he that believeth in Me, the works that I do, he also shall do, and greater than these shall he do" (14: 12).

As proof that early Christians believed they possessed this promised power, we may refer to the Epistle of St. James (5: 14–16): "The prayer of faith shall save the sick man. . . . Confess ye therefore your sins to one another, and pray for one another, that ye may be healed. Great is the power of the prayer which the just

[67] Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, II, 465.
[68] Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 1903, pp. 53–65.

man putteth forth." Let us note that in the immediately preceding context we have the words, "anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." Hence we can scarcely doubt that in this passage at least, as well as in the Fourth Gospel, the phrase "in the name of Jesus" means "while invoking the name of Jesus." Hence our surmise is well grounded that the Evangelist presupposes a liturgical custom of calling on the name of Jesus. And this surmise becomes almost a certainty by other passages in the New Testament in which we recognize clearly the primitive Christian custom of praying in the name of Jesus. The exegesis we have just given of the Gospel of St. John throws new light on these passages.

We find an almost exact parallel to this in Eph. 5: 19 f.: "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord, giving thanks always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." But the chief passage in question is Col. 3: 17: "Whatsoever ye do in word or in work, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him." Here too let us note the immediately preceding context: "In psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles sing in your hearts to God by His grace" (3: 16).

If we note the context (2: 4 ff.) to the passage in Colossians just quoted we see that St. Paul is insisting on the contrast between Christian and non-Christian mysteries. In these latter we recognize a liturgical veneration of angels. Hence in this passage, as a result of this contrast, we feel in an especial manner the force of

the admonition that Christians should call on God by the name of Jesus and not as non-Christians do by the name of angels.

We must note some peculiarities in St. Paul's terminology. His constantly recurring phrase "in Christ" or "through Christ" is equivalent to St. John's phrase "in the name of Jesus." This fact is evident from the passage quoted above (Col. 3: 17), where we see the two phrases, "in the name of the Lord Jesus" and "through Him," used as equivalents. It is evident also from the passage in Rom. 1: 8, "I give thanks to my God through Jesus Christ." This same passage illustrates St. Paul's habitual use of the name "Christ" as being identical with "Jesus." The phrases "through Christ" and "in Christ" correspond to the Old Testament custom of putting the name for the person, as may be seen in II Thess. 1: 12: "that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ be glorified in you," where evidently the phrase "that the name be glorified" signifies "that the person be glorified."

For the reader's convenience we here list the passages where St. Paul, in speaking of prayer, unites the name of Christ to the name of God by the prepositions "through" and "in." Passages with "through" are: Rom. 1: 8; 5: 1; 7: 25; 15: 30; 16: 27; II Cor. 1: 20; 3: 4; Eph. 2: 18; Col. 3: 17. Passages with "in" are: Rom. 15: 17; II Cor. 2: 14; Eph. 3: 20; Phil. 2: 10; 4: 6 f.; I Thess. 5: 17 f.; Eph. 5: 20; Col. 3: 17. From all these passages we derive the conclusion: one who lives in Christ does everything and prays everything through Christ or in the name of Christ.

We may go a step farther. In these Pauline phrases, "in Christ" and "through Jesus Christ," we have probably the deepest and most original meaning of the expression "in the name of." This meaning appears most strikingly in St. Paul's words to the Galatians (4: 6), where he says that the Spirit of the Son infused into us as children by God makes our prayer a prayer in and through Christ, a prayer in the name of Christ, a prayer that is Christ's. Hence prayer so made has all the characteristics of a child's prayer, and hence, being according to the divine will, is certain of being heard.[69]

Nor must we forget that according to St. Paul's mind these phrases "in Christ" and "through Christ" involve a mediatorship of Jesus in the proper sense of the word. Jesus is the mediator of our prayer with the Father. St. John expresses this same truth in the phrase, "we have an advocate (paraclete) with the Father, Jesus Christ the just." [70] The same idea of mediatorship is indicated in St. Paul's word to Timothy, "For there is one God, one mediator also between God and man, Himself man, Christ Jesus." [71] The context draws attention to the distinction between Jesus as the one and sole mediator and the multiple mediators in non-Christian religions.

We may here recall what we have already said about the position which the idea of mediatorship occupies in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Throughout this long epistle the mediatorship of the high priest Jesus in the

[69] Cf. I John 5: 14.
[70] I John 2: 1; cf. John 14: 26; 15: 26; 16: 7.
[71] I Tim. 2: 5.

heavenly sanctuary is illustrated by repeated reference to the Old Testament priesthood and to the liturgical functions performed by that priesthood. We now see how closely this idea is paralleled by St. John's frequent use of the phrase "in the name of" as an invocation addressed to the name of Jesus after His ascension to the right hand of God.

The agreement among these three sources (St. John, St. Paul, and the Epistle to the Hebrews) strengthens our conclusion that the early Christians were accustomed in their liturgical assemblies to address their prayers to God in the name of Jesus. This conclusion is further strengthened by reference to the doxologies so frequent in St. Paul's epistles. We find as characteristic of these doxologies the presence of the established liturgical formulas "in Christ," "through Christ," and "in the name of Jesus Christ." [72]

We must go one step farther. We find in I Cor. 5: 4 the technical phrase, evidently usual in that day, "an assembly in the name of the Lord Jesus." This expression here signifies the liturgical meetings of the early Christians. In a parallel Gospel passage (Matt. 18: 19 f.), Jesus says that where two or three are gathered in prayer they are united by His name and that He is present by His name in their gathering. Let us note that this expression designating the assemblies of the early Christians is derived from public prayer as the chief element in those primitive liturgical gatherings.

We do not maintain that we have here exhausted all genuine meanings of the phrase "to pray in the name

[72] Rom. 1: 8; 16: 27; I Cor. 1: 3 f.; Eph. 1: 3; 3: 21; I Pet. 4: 11.

of." The remark has been made,[73] we think correctly, that since many different explanations of this prayer are to be found and since each contains a true element, so likewise the early Christians may have differed in the special sense which they assigned to the expression. But what we do maintain is that the early Christians had liturgical gatherings at which they prayed to God in the name of Jesus and that this practice antedates the written accounts in the New Testament and that the phraseology of the latter is to a large extent an echo of that practice.

PRAYER TO THE GLORIFIED LORD

Prayer to God "in the name of Jesus" develops naturally into prayer addressed directly to Jesus. This conclusion, which we might presuppose, is explicitly guaranteed by the word of our Lord in St. John (14: 13), "Whatsoever you shall ask in My name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son." With this text we may compare Matt. 10: 28, "Every one who confesses Me before men, him will I confess before My Father." These texts with others like them enable us to find a technical term for "Christians" in St. Paul's phrase, "those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." [74]

This designation for Christians emphasizes, not that they are believers in Jesus, but the fact that they are invokers of Jesus or adorers of Jesus.

In Greek literature, both classical and popular, we

[73] Von Klawek, *Das Gebet zu Jesus*, 1921, p. 54.
[74] Rom. 10: 12 ff.; I Cor. 1: 2; cf. Acts 2: 21; 9: 14, 21; 22: 16.

find the term "to call upon" used in the specific sense of calling upon the gods. The verb "to pray" in the Hebrew Scripture is translated in the Septuagint by the phrase "to call upon the name of the Lord." [75] Here lies the basis for the expression "to call upon the name of Christ." In Jewish mentality the name stands for the person. This habit of mind is illustrated in the passage from the prophet Joel, which St. Paul introduces in Rom. 10: 13: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." He does not preface the quotation with any reference to the prophet, but uses the word as one familiar to Christians. He uses the phrase "those who call upon the name of the Lord" as equivalent to "those who call upon the name of Jesus."

What is the origin of this expression for "Christians"? The origin we find most probable is that it was first used by the Jews in their conflict with the Apostles. In the Sanhedrin's sentence condemning the Apostles we note that they are forbidden "to speak to any man in this name." Evidently the invocation of Christ by the Apostles is something that horrifies the Jews. This invocation of Christ becomes a characteristic stamp of the new religion. Hence we think it probable that these Jewish enemies were the first to refer to the Christians as "those who call upon the name of Christ." This usage by the foes of Christianity was by way of condemnation and disparagement, as was the term "Christians." [76] This conclusion is strengthened by noting that

[75] Lesètre, *Dict. Bibl.*, s.v. "Prière," first called attention to this.
[76] Acts 11: 26.

Christians do not seem to have referred to themselves as those who call upon the name of Christ. The passages in which the phrase occurs are relatively few. Likewise few are the prayers which are addressed directly to Jesus.[77]

From the passage in Joel (2: 32) falls new light on the other New Testament passages which speak of invoking the name of Jesus. We can hardly suppose that the phrase was first used of the private prayer of Christians. Rather we are justified in maintaining that the phrase, originally a Jewish accusation, designates the public liturgical prayer of the Christian community. The context (2: 14 ff.) of the passage in Joel points in the same direction. Joel is addressing those who participate in the liturgical worship of the Temple. Hence by the law of Hebrew parallelism the passage here under consideration must have this meaning: he who participates in the public worship of God will be saved. When, therefore, St. Paul applies the passage to Christ in a way that is familiar to all his hearers, we must understand the phrase as saying: he who participates in Christian worship of God will be saved. This conception will enable us to understand the full liturgical meaning that lies behind the beautiful passage in Phil. 2: 9–11: "Wherefore God hath infinitely exalted Him [78] and hath bestowed on Him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should

[77] In Acts 9: 14. Ananias is probably using the words of the official document given by the Sanhedrin to Saul.

[78] Ὑπερύψωσεν.

bend in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

This custom of applying to Christ Old Testament expressions that refer to God is found elsewhere in the New Testament. Particularly we note that the Old Testament "Adonai" is applied to Jesus in the phrase "Jesus is the Lord." We do not intend to pursue this subject further. What we do wish to show is that the early Christian liturgy was familiar not only with prayer to God in the name of Jesus, but with prayer addressed directly to Jesus the glorified Lord. First of all we can show that St. Paul is familiar with an explicit prayer to Christ which he himself uses and which he recommends to his communities. In II Cor. 12: 1 f., he says: "There was given me a thorn in my flesh, an angel of Satan to buffet me. About this thrice did I beseech the Lord that it might depart from me. And He said to me: 'My grace is sufficient for thee, for strength is made perfect in infirmity.' " The immediately subsequent context shows that St. Paul is praying directly to Christ.

In I Cor. 16: 21–24 we find reference to one of St. Paul's favorite prayers: "I, Paul, greet you with my own hand. If anyone loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema. Maranatha. The grace of the Lord Jesus be with you. My love be with you all in Christ Jesus." The word "Maranatha" may be understood [79] either as an indicative in the sense of "the Lord is near," [80] or more probably as an imperative in the sense of "come, Lord

[79] Cf. Dölger, *Sol salutis,* 1920, p. 150.
[80] Phil. 4: 5.

Jesus." [81] Why did St. Paul preserve this prayer in its original Aramaic? The best answer we can give is that the prayer was known both to him and to his hearers from their familiarity with the Christian primitive liturgy.[82] This prayer, then, "Maranatha," is the oldest public prayer to Jesus recorded in the New Testament.

The oldest private prayer to Jesus is the last prayer of St. Stephen: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. . . . Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." [83] The only argument that is urged against the genuineness of this expression is its similarity with the account given in St. Luke's Gospel [84] of the last words of Jesus: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do. . . . Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit." But this argument is really an argument for the authenticity of the recorded prayer of St. Stephen. Since St. Luke (cf. 1: 3) was so careful in investigating his sources, and since in the present instance he could profit by the testimony of St. Paul, who was an eyewitness of the event, we are justified in finding in this testimony a specially weighty witness for early Christian prayer to Jesus. The words of the dying disciple addressed to Jesus are almost identical with the words which the dying Jesus addressed to the Father.

We can find an indirect argument for our contention that the early Christian community addressed prayers to Jesus. This argument is found in the prayerful wishes so often seen in St. Paul's epistles. As a most strik-

[81] Apoc. 22: 20.
[82] Cf. *Didache*, X, 6.
[83] Acts 7: 59 f.
[84] Luke 23: 34, 46.

ing example we quote I Thess. 3: 9–13. "For what thanksgiving can we render to God for you, for all the gladness wherewith we rejoice for your sakes before our God? Night and day we pray most earnestly that we may behold you face to face, and make good what is lacking to your faith. May God our Father Himself and our Lord Jesus Christ make straight our way unto you; and may the Lord make you yourselves to increase and abound in love toward one another and toward all, even as we abound toward you, so as to strengthen your hearts without reproach in holiness before God our Father at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints."

The heartfelt tone of these sentences shows that they are a spontaneous expression of his inmost thought and life. The more spontaneous this thought is the more precious is the passage for anyone who is searching for the sources of early Christian liturgical veneration for Christ and prayer to Him. In this passage we find "God our Father" and "our Lord Jesus Christ" united in a single invocation. In the immediately subsequent context the prayer is addressed to Jesus alone. He is called "Lord," a term which in the ancient liturgical world implies divine honor. We reasonably infer from the whole wording of the passage that the expressions were familiar to the Thessalonian Christians. St. Paul uses these expressions to urge upon his readers that they pray for him: "Pray without ceasing" (5: 17); "Pray for us" (5: 25).

Can we admit that expressions like those we have mentioned mean simply prayer to God through the

mediation of Jesus? No, we cannot. Primitive Christians did not merely pray to God in the name of Jesus, but prayed to Jesus just as they did to God. We admit that the passages are few, but we maintain that they are obvious instances of such direct prayer to Christ.

In Philippians St. Paul says that, since Jesus has the form of God, He should be worshiped as God. This conclusion comes naturally from the premises.[85] And when we find that Jesus, after His glorification at the right hand of God, is called the Son of God in power [86] and when we find that Jesus, like God, distributes grace and mercy in His own right,[87] we have no reason to think that the prayers for peace, grace, and mercy which are addressed to Jesus are to be understood as addressed to Him as mediator. And if, lastly, Jesus is "the Lord of all," [88] then we must admit that Christians would express this truth also in their liturgical prayers. Christ, the Lord of all, would have in Christianity the place occupied by "the many lords" in pagan religions.[89]

We must say another word on the doxologies, those brief hymn-like prayers of praise and blessing, which occur frequently in the New Testament writings, and which carry with them clear evidence of their liturgical origin. These doxologies are often introduced just as they are in the Septuagint with the expression "blessed be." This expression alone is not a sure sign that the veneration is to a divine person. We find, in-

[85] Phil. 2: 6.
[86] Rom. 1: 4.
[87] Rom. 1: 5; 5: 15; 16: 20; I Cor. 7: 25; 16: 23; Gal. 6: 18.
[88] Acts 10: 36.
[89] I Cor. 8: 6.

deed, that "blessed be" is a characteristic predicate of God in Jewish literature. In the New Testament, too, the expression is almost always used of God.[90] But we also find it applied to men.[91] Consequently we may not conclude that the divinity of Christ is implied by the words "Hosanna, blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." [92]

On the other hand, we find the doxology used in a sense that belongs beyond all doubt to God alone.[93] And we must note how, in these doxologies, we have expressed prayer "through Christ," followed immediately by prayer to Christ. The most striking example will be found in I Pet. 4: 11: "That in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the might forever and ever." Another impressive instance is in the Second Epistle to Timothy, where St. Paul addresses Christ by an expression which otherwise he uses only of God. "To whom be glory forever and ever. Amen." [94]

We may find the same conclusion confirmed by the fact that hymns and songs are addressed sometimes to God, sometimes to the Lord Jesus Christ. Early in the second century Pliny, in his letter to Trajan, says that, when Christians assemble, they sing hymns to Christ as to a God. What Pliny here records is, as we have already

[90] Rom. 1: 25.
[91] Luke 1: 42.
[92] Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, II, 121 note 7.
[93] Rom. 11: 36; Gal. 1: 5; Eph. 3: 21; Phil. 4: 20; I Tim. 1: 17; 6: 16; I Pet. 4: 11; Jude 25.
[94] 4: 18. Cf. Heb. 13: 21; II Pet. 3: 18; Apoc. 1: 6; 5: 13; 7: 10.

seen, an established practice even before the time of the writing of the New Testament.

Primitive Christian liturgy practiced solemn prayer to Jesus. This fact is beyond doubt, even though the recorded prayers which express this truth are relatively few as compared with those which address God in the name of Jesus. We may briefly notice the reason why Christians as a rule preferred to pray to God through Christ than to pray to Christ Himself directly. We find the reason expressed in St. Paul's words to the Colossians (3: 17): "All that you do or say, do in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks through Him to God the Father." A basis for this reason is set forth by St. Paul in II Cor. 1: 20, where he says that through Christ all promises of God are realized. Guided by these truths, the early Christian community more often prayed to God through Christ, in the name of Christ, than to Christ Himself as the glorified Lord.

As regards the origin of this practice, we may note that the Jews prayed to God, not through mediation of any person, but always directly, and that consequently Christians felt that their practice of praying to God through Christ was a manner of praying which marked them off from the Jews. Thus converts from Judaism would not so easily feel the necessity of direct prayer to Jesus. We may surmise that the Christian practice of praying directly to Jesus arose among the Gentile Christians under the influence of the personal experiences and practices of St. Paul.[95] Hence we should

[95] Baumstark, *Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie*, 1923, pp. 90 f.

appreciate the fact that earliest Christianity was familiar with the solemn acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord,[96] and also with immediate prayer to Christ the Lord of all, "who shows His riches to all who call upon Him." [97]

[96] Rom. 10: 9; I Cor. 12: 3.
[97] Rom. 10: 12.

CHAPTER XIII

CONTENTS OF LITURGICAL PRAYER

THE early Christians prayed for their daily needs. This practice corresponds to a certain petition of the Our Father and to various exhortations of Jesus in the matter of prayer. By way of example we note the following. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (1: 10) says: "Unceasingly I make mention of you at all times in my prayers, beseeching that ere long I may at last by the will of God be sped on my way to you." Again he says: "Strive together with me in your prayers on my behalf to God, that I may be delivered from them in Judea who believe not, and that my ministrations at Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints" (15: 31).[1] The Apostle is surely praying in the spirit of Jesus when he says (Phil. 4: 6): "Have no anxieties, but in every circumstance, by prayer and petition joined with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known to God." Now these requests are certainly not to be restricted to merely spiritual blessings. So, too, in what St. James says about the anointing of the sick. His words are: "Is any one sick among you? Let him call in the priests of the

1 Rom. 15: 31.

Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up." [2]

Christians were encouraged in this practice by their confidence of being heard. St. James says: "If any one of you lack wisdom . . . let him ask in faith, in no wise wavering." [3] The Christians believed that, even when their need was beyond human help, they might confidently have recourse to prayer. We see an instance of this in St. Peter's prayer when he raised Tabitha to life.[4] Christians indeed feel that they do not know how to pray as they ought. But they are equally certain that the Spirit who in them cries out, "Abba, Father," [5] comes to the aid of their weakness. They know that "to those that love God, God makes everything turn unto good" and that if God is for them nothing can be against them.[6]

St. Paul's language here bears a certain resemblance to the conceptions of Hellenistic mysticism, which also speak of a dwelling of God in the form of spirit in human hearts. But we find a fundamental difference. For St. Paul this divine Spirit poured into our hearts is the Spirit of Christ. Only by loving union with Christ have Christians entered into the relation of children with God, since only by Christ has God accepted them as adopted children. Hence that spirit of adoptive son-

[2] Jas. 5: 14 f.
[3] Jas. 1: 6.
[4] Acts 9: 40.
[5] Rom. 8: 15, 26.
[6] Rom. 8: 28 ff.

ship which leads Christians to pray, "Abba, Father," is at the same time the Spirit of Christ, a spirit which imposes on them the obligation to bring forth works worthy of this sonship, which works are the fruits of this Spirit.

Hence, too, the prayer of Christians who, taken together, form the body of Christ,[7] is common mutual prayer of one for the other. It is a prayer arising from their common consciousness of adoptive sonship. Their possession of this spirit is the distinctive characteristic of Christianity. Herein lies the deeper reason for the many exhortations toward mutual help in prayer, which we find in St. Paul's epistles.[8] Passages like these are not sufficiently explained by merely pastoral considerations. The same truth holds good of the following passages. "Night and day we pray more earnestly that we may behold you face to face, and make good what is lacking to your faith." [9] "Now I beseech you, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and through that charity which is of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers on my behalf to God, that I may be delivered from them in Judea who believe not, and that my ministrations at Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints. Thus I shall come to you in joy, God willing, and with you have rest. The God of peace be with you all. Amen." [10] Finally we notice that this mutual prayer finds its special place in their common assemblies.[11]

[7] I Cor. 10: 17.
[8] Col. 4: 3; I Thess. 1: 2; 2: 13; 5: 25; II Thess. 1: 11; Philem. 22.
[9] I Thess. 3: 10.
[10] Rom. 15: 30 ff.
[11] Acts 12: 5 ff.

We have here the explanation for what is at first sight a strange phenomenon in St. Paul's life of prayer. If we except Rom. 10: 1, where the Apostle prays for the Jews, he never prays for non-Christians explicitly. Are we to see in this phenomenon a departure from our Lord's practice of praying for all, even for His enemies? No. The words in I Tim. 2: 1 f., alone suffice to disprove this supposition. This passage is as follows: "I urge that petitions, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made on behalf of all men, on behalf of kings and all who are in high station." We have here that prayer for pagans which we find in non-scriptural early Christian authors.

Moreover, this supposition is not at all in harmony with the obligation so often enforced by St. Paul to do good to all men,[12] to feel that we are debtors to all men and should become all things to all men in order to gain all men for Christ.[13] Nor is it in harmony with his method of intercession which includes all men, even those who are unknown. For instance, we read in Philippians, "greetings to every saint in Christ Jesus." [14]

It is excluded by St. Paul's conviction that he is the special Apostle of the Gentiles. He begs God to have mercy on all.[15] His God is the God whose name he praises among the Gentiles.[16]

We may admit that certain passages have a tone of strong personal feeling. For instance, in I Cor. 5: 5, we

[12] Gal. 1: 16.
[13] Rom. 5: 18; 8: 32; 11: 32; I Cor. 9: 19 ff.
[14] Phil. 4: 21.
[15] Rom. 11: 32.
[16] Rom. 15: 9.

read: "I have already, as if really present, passed judgment in the name of the Lord Jesus, upon him . . . deciding to deliver up such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." [17] But these passages do not refute our contention. On the other hand, we have direct passages which support our contention. In I Cor. 4: 12 f. we read: "We are reviled and we bless, we are persecuted and we endure, we are defamed and we entreat." In Rom. 12: 14 we find the following: "Bless those who persecute you, bless them and curse them not."

Let us here note how sharply this universal spirit of prayer contrasts with the practice of cursing one's enemies which was common among the pagans, as we may see in the malediction tablets of all kinds which have lately been discovered. We may likewise note the practice among the Jews as recorded in the psalms, of wishing vengeance on their enemies. These texts of St. Paul and likewise the common custom of universal intercessory prayer in early Christianity are the best proof that the spirit of Jesus and of God animated the newly converted Christians in their prayer.

Here we have no longer room for malediction prayers and psalms of vengeance. True, in St. Paul we find no explicit prayers for non-Christians. While this fact does not evidence any lack of universalism in prayer, on the other hand it indicates the privileged status of Christians because they alone possess the Spirit.

The common bond of the divine Spirit which united Christians distinguished them especially in their com-

[17] Cf. II Cor. 11: 16 ff.; Phil. 3: 2.

mon assemblies. Let us compare two texts. St. James (5: 16) says: "Pray for one another." St. Paul, writing to the Ephesians (6: 18 f.), says: "With all prayer and supplication, pray at every season in the Spirit; on that be intent, ever persevering in supplication for all the saints, and on my behalf also." Both texts presuppose the practice of common public prayer for all the faithful.

But however prominent mutual intercessory prayer may be, solemn and public glorification of God is still more prominent. Let us listen to St. Paul (Rom. 15: 5–7): "Now the God of patience and of comfort grant you to be of one mind toward one another, according to Christ Jesus, that one in spirit ye may with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." Similar to this passage are many of the texts and doxologies we have already quoted. Solemn thanksgivings to God and glorifications of Him are found everywhere in the New Testament. Barely one-third of the prayers recorded in the New Testament are concerned with intercession. But expressions of thanksgiving [18] recur with surprising frequency. And their solemn liturgical form is evidence that these prayers are of liturgical origin.

We may admit that many of these prayers were originally personal prayers. As an example of these prayers, we draw the reader's attention to St. Paul's account of the conflict between the law in his members and the law of his mind, in Rom. 7: 14–25. In II Cor. 2: 13 f. we read: "I found no relief for my spirit, for that I found

[18] Cf. Rom. 7: 14, 25; II Cor. 1: 11; 2: 14.

not Titus my brother. . . . But thanks be to God who at all times leadeth us in triumph in Christ." Again in II Cor. 1: 11, we read the following touching prayer: "In Him we have hope that He will yet again deliver us, through the cooperation of your prayers on our behalf. Thus for the grace that is bestowed on us at the instance of many, thanks also will be rendered for us by many lips." Although these prayers may indeed have originally been personal, yet we may reasonably suppose that as they appear in the sacred text they represent a liturgical usage.

A still more striking illustration is found in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians. This passage (1: 3–14) has the style of a prose hymn. It is an unbroken prayer of thanksgiving and intercession. It is the classic example to show how personal prayer influenced liturgical prayer and vice versa. The introductory phrase ("blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ") is found elsewhere [19] in the New Testament as also in Jewish prayers of blessing and praise. The presence of this phrase justifies our inference that the hymn has a liturgical origin.

The custom of adding epithets to the name of God is Jewish in origin. But in our present passage from Ephesians we feel how the Jewish custom has been penetrated by a Christian spirit. We observe the contrast between the Jewish expression "the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob" and the formula used by St. Paul, "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." These formulas must have been common in the liturgical prayers

[19] Luke 1: 68; II Cor. 1: 3; I Pet. 1: 3.

of the early Christian communities. The same holds good for the following expressions: "Father of glory" (Eph. 1: 17), "rich in mercy" (2: 4), and especially for the solemn doxology, "one God and Father in all, who is above all, and through all, and in all" (4: 6).

All these phrases serve to express that childlike attitude to God which Christians inherited from Christ. In similar fashion we find that Christians attach the qualification "the Holy One," "the King," "the Lord" to God's name as "Father." "To the Father belongs thanksgiving," [20] because "He blesses us with all blessings." [21] "The Father of mercy and God of all consolation." [22] "In Him ye have been enriched in everything, in all utterance and all knowledge. . . . In no gift are ye lacking." [23] The early Christian communities evidently regarded thanksgiving as one of their most important duties. They gave it an importance greater than it had had in the Old Testament. Thus we find St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans condemning, as a primary offense of the pagans, their failure to glorify God and to give Him thanks.

Christians had still other reasons for believing that prayers of thanksgiving are especially pleasing to God. St. Paul, urging the Corinthian Christians to contribute generously to the needs of the Church in Jerusalem, says in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians [24] that the recipients of their generosity will both glorify God and

[20] Eph. 5: 20.
[21] Eph. 1: 3.
[22] II Cor. 1: 3.
[23] I Cor. 1: 4 ff.
[24] II Cor. 9: 12 ff.

make supplication in behalf of their benefactors. Passages like these show that early Christian prayer was in no way divorced from that form of divine service which consists in beneficence to our neighbor. But we note that early Christians considered this duty a privilege rather than a burden. In a similar spirit are the exhortations addressed to primitive Apostolic circles. For instance, St. Peter urges Christians to accompany prayer with purity of heart; [25] St. James, with justice and control of the tongue; [26] St. John, with observance of the commandments.[27]

On the other hand, we may trace more directly to Jewish influence the habit of accompanying prayer with vigils,[28] with fasting and almsgiving.[29] Also the practice of special times of public prayer [30] is well known to Judaism. Thus St. Paul exhorts husbands and wives to abstain from the exercise of conjugal rights during certain periods of prayer.[31] This idea, as we have said, is not exclusively Christian. It is found both among the Jews and among the pagans. For the idea among the Jews, we note, for example, the following passage: "Moses came down from the mount to the people, and sanctified them. And when they had washed their garments, he said to them: Be ready against the third day, and come not near your wives." [32]

25 Jas. 4: 3; I Pet. 1: 17; Apoc. 14: 2, 4.
26 Jas. 5: 16.
27 I John 3: 22.
28 Eph. 6: 18.
29 Acts 10: 2, 31; 13: 3.
30 Acts 10: 9, 30; 27: 35; Rom. 14: 6; I Cor. 7: 5.
31 I Cor. 7: 5; cf. I Pet. 3: 7. But see also, I Thess. 5: 17, "pray without ceasing."
32 Ex. 19: 15. Cf. Lev. 15: 18; Deut. 23: 11; I Kings 21: 5 f.; II Kings 11: 11.

Nor must we forget that in passages like I Cor. 7: 5 and in I Pet. 3: 7, discussed above, we are dealing with public prayer which needs regulation. We have merely to bear in mind that no contradiction exists between public liturgical prayer and the private prayer of the child with the Father. In private we have what St. Paul calls "prayer by unspeakable groanings," whereas public prayer demands forms of speech that are understood by everybody. In I Cor. 14: 4–17, St. Paul speaks at length of this subject. From this passage we quote a few significant phrases: "If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding reapeth no profit. What then is to be done? I will pray with my spirit, I will pray with my understanding also; I will sing with my spirit, I will sing with my understanding also. . . . I speak in tongues, I thank God, more than you all; nevertheless in church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, so as to instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue." In this passage, "praying with the spirit" refers to private prayer; "praying with the understanding" refers to public liturgical prayer. Similarly we find in St. Paul's phrase, "unspeakable groanings," a reference to private prayer. In public prayer he wishes to have these ecstatic gifts kept in the background. Thus, in I Cor. 14: 23, he says: "If then the whole church be assembled together, and all be speaking in tongues, and *idiotae* or unbelievers enter, will they not say that ye are raving?"

The nature of public prayer requires that restrictions be laid on spontaneous private prayer in Christian public assemblies. But we must not exaggerate the extent

of these restrictions. In the Church at Corinth, St. Paul still permitted each member, under the influence of the Spirit, to pronounce a spontaneous prayer in the name of all. This prayer was then confirmed by each one saying "Amen." Hence they were persuaded that, although restrictions were needed in public prayer, still each member was in possession of the Spirit. Whether in a given case the prayer thus spoken was really spoken in the Spirit of Jesus, that is, in the Spirit of God, remained to be determined. St. Paul summarizes the question in the last verse of that chapter 14 which we have been considering. He says: "Wherefore, my brethren, covet the gift of prophesying, and forbid not speaking in tongues; but let all things be done becomingly and in order." In St. Paul's mind, order is not the enemy of love and freedom.

In summary we may draw attention to the sublimity of early Christian prayer, its specific distinction, and the dangers that surround it. The most precious inheritance is union with the Spirit of Jesus manifested by the preference for the name "Father," by the emphasis on praise and thanksgiving, by the certainty of being heard, by the common public character of Christian prayer, and by the importance given to prayer in the name of Jesus, to prayer in and through Christ.

The specific trait of early Christian prayer is in the fact that it is addressed to the glorified Lord and in the liturgical prayer which arises from this glorification.

The dangers that surrounded this prayer arose from the following three sources: the abundance of ecstatic gifts of the Spirit with consequent necessity of insist-

ence on sobriety and order in the public assemblies; the influences of Jewish and pagan antecedents on the formation of Christian prayer; the presence of certain elements that were not to be found in the explicit teaching and example of Christ.

This last danger may be observed even in the New Testament writings, although there it does not have that importance which it had in later development. In the New Testament writings, with which we are here concerned, no attempt is made to conceal human weaknesses. Nevertheless they present us the picture of genuine, living, and unified liturgical prayer founded on the teaching and example and person of Jesus.

CHAPTER XIV

SCRIPTURE READING IN COMMON

AT the time when Christianity began, the synagogal liturgy was still flourishing. The two chief elements of the synagogal liturgy were worship and doctrine. In the doctrinal element two categories are to be distinguished; one was the reading (sedra) from the Pentateuch; the other was made up of passages (haftorahs) taken from other books of Scripture and introduced as commentaries on the sedras. These two readings in this order are responsible for the New Testament formula "law and prophets" as a term signifying the Old Testament. Evidence of the antiquity of this practice can be found in that sentence with which the Apostles conclude their circular letter to the Churches: "Moses from olden times hath them that preach him in every city in the synagogues, being read every Sabbath." [1]

A command to read from the Pentateuch is found in Deut. 31: 10–13: "When all Israel come together . . . thou shalt read the words of this law before all Israel, in their hearing." We have further the account of one such reading in Nehemias, chapter 8, where Esdras

[1] Acts 15: 21.

binds the community to observe the Mosaic Law. Since this reading was in Hebrew, it had to be translated into the language of the people.

A Jewish author [2] maintains that the reading of Scripture was the origin of the first Jewish liturgical assemblies. The five books of Moses, the Pentateuch, commonly called the Mosaic Law, were divided into fifty-four portions (sedras), of which one was read on each Sabbath. The reading was performed in the following fashion. From the assembled community, three or four were called upon to take their places in turn at the reading desk on a platform. Each read his portion in a traditional chant. No one was allowed to read without being invited by the chief of the synagogue; the chief himself had to await the invitation of the assembled community. The taking of the Scripture rolls and the replacing of them was a ceremony performed with solemnity.

The practice in the synagogues of reading from the Law and from the Prophets was well established at the time when the Apostles began their ministry of preaching. As evidence of this, we read in the Acts of the Apostles: [3] Paul and Barnabas "entered the synagogue upon the Sabbath day and took their seats." After the reading of the Law and of the Prophets, the presidents of the synagogue sent word to them saying: "Brethren, if ye have any words of exhortation unto the people, speak." How old this practice was, we have no means of discovering. Nor do we know with certainty whether the

[2] Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst,* 1924, p. 155.
[3] Acts 13: 14 f.

choice of the particular haftorah was left to the reader or whether the choice was determined by an officially established order. Thus in the account which St. Luke [4] gives of the scene when Jesus read a haftorah, we cannot say whether our Lord chose the passage from Isaias [5] of His own accord or whether that passage was handed to Him to read. The fact that this particular prophet was handed to Him shows that the reader's choice was at least to some extent restricted.

From the New Testament we obtain the following picture of the way Old Testament readings formed part of the early Christian liturgy. The antiquity of the practice and the importance attached to it are evidenced by the concluding sentence of St. James' speech at the meeting of the Apostles at Jerusalem: "Moses from early generations hath them that preach him in every city in the synagogues, being read every Sabbath." [6] We can go a step farther. The comprehensive knowledge of the Old Testament presupposed by New Testament writers on the part of their readers cannot be explained on the basis of merely private reading of the Old Testament, but only on the basis of public and systematic reading in their meetings. St. James is referring to Christian assemblies on the Sabbath.

Christian preaching placed more emphasis upon the Prophets than upon the Law, and still more emphasis upon the fulfilment of the prophecies than upon the prophecies themselves. St. Paul's sermon at Antioch in

[4] Luke 4: 16 ff.
[5] Is. 61: 1 ff.
[6] Acts 15: 21.

Pisidia is an apt illustration.[7] The general principle is laid down by St. Paul in these words: "For whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our instruction, that through patience and through the comfort of the Scriptures we may have hope." [8]

Christians regarded the Old Testament as a book indispensable for them especially in their controversies with the Jews. Hence they had it read publicly in their liturgical services. Without such reading the usual scriptural teaching and argumentation would have been unintelligible. Following the practice of Jesus, the early Christians regarded the Old Testament as the life of Christ in prophecy. Hence the practice of the early missioners, who presented the life of Jesus as a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies.

When we come to details, we think naturally first of all of St. Matthew's practice throughout his Gospel of interrupting his narrative, after relating some event, to recall some Old Testament promise or prophecy as fulfilled in the event narrated. St. John has the same practice. For instance, in the twelfth chapter, after the account of our Lord's triumphant entry into Jerusalem and His subsequent controversy with the unbelieving multitude, the Evangelist pauses to quote a passage of Isaias as foretelling this unbelief. The passage is taken from 6: 9: "He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes nor understand with their heart and be converted,

[7] Acts 13: 16 ff.
[8] Rom. 15: 4.

and I should heal them." The Evangelist adds: "These things said Isaias, when he saw His glory and spoke of Him." Similar uses of Old Testament prophecies may be found elsewhere in this same Gospel.[9] At the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles we have a similar form of argumentation. St. Peter in his first sermon, on Pentecost,[10] quotes the prophets several times. For example, the Apostle quotes from the prophet Joel at considerable length,[11] saying, among other things: "Yea, upon My servants also and upon My handmaids, in those days shall I pour forth of My Spirit, and they shall prophesy." [12]

In Acts 18: 24 we read that Apollo was "powerful in the Scriptures," that is, skilled in the interpretation of the Old Testament. As evident from the fact that he had a following among the Corinthian Christians,[13] we may consider as highly probable that he used this method of arguing from the Scriptures in his preaching to Gentile converts. Hence we may reasonably suppose that these converts were familiar with the Old Testament.

To see St. Paul's practice, let us note the passage in Gal. 4: 21 f., where St. Paul says: "Tell me, ye that wish to be under the Law, will ye not listen to the Law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by the bondwoman and one by the freewoman." Such a method

9 John 13: 18; 15: 25; 17: 12; 18: 9; 19: 24, 36, 37.
10 Acts 2: 14–36.
11 Joel 2: 28 ff.
12 Cf. Acts 3: 18; 10: 43; I Pet. 1: 11.
13 See also I Cor. 1: 12.

of arguing presupposes that his readers are familiar with Old Testament history.[14] The Epistle to the Hebrews amply confirms this position. But of this epistle enough has already been said.

Now we come to passages which are more specific evidence of this practice. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (chap. 3), we read: "Nor do we act as did Moses, who was wont to place a covering over his face. . . . To this very day, when Moses is read, the covering doth lie upon their hearts." These words of St. Paul imply that his readers were acquainted with the Jewish practice of uncovering the sacred rolls of Scripture when they were to be read. Such expressions imply that these Old Testament Scriptures continued to be read in the Christian assemblies as they had been read in the synagogue.

A second passage occurs in the Second Epistle to Timothy: "From infancy thou hast known the sacred writings." [15] "Sacred writings" in this context obviously means the Old Testament, as it does on the lips of our Lord, when He said: "Ye have the Scriptures; these are they that give testimony of Me." [16] Again in the First Epistle to Timothy, St. Paul says to his disciple: "Until I come, attend to reading." [17] "Reading" is the technical term for the public reading of Scripture in the religious assemblies.[18]

Again in II Tim. 3: 16, we read: "Every scripture is

[14] Cf. Rom. 4: 23; 7: 1; I Cor. 6: 16; 10: 11.
[15] II Tim. 3: 15.
[16] John 5: 39.
[17] I Tim. 4: 13.
[18] He stood up to read: Luke 4: 16.

inspired of God." The Christians shared fully with the Jews the belief in the divine inspiration of the Old Testament. For this reason, if for no other, they would have continued to read the Scriptures in their own assemblies.

Do we find scriptural evidence that, in the early Christian liturgical assemblies, the practice prevailed of reading from passages of New Testament books that had already been written? We have such evidence in the epistles, the Gospels, and the Apocalypse.

A striking testimony is found in St. Paul's words to his disciple Timothy. Referring to the double honor due to priests, especially to those who labor in preaching and teaching, St. Paul says: "For the Scripture saith: 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that is threshing,' and again, 'The laborer is worthy of his hire.' " [19] The former text cited by St. Paul is from the Old Testament.[20] The second text is found in St. Luke.[21] Evidently in St. Paul's mind the word "Scripture" includes both the Old Testament and the New.

We are familiar with the phrase, "he that readeth, let him understand," which occurs parenthetically in the Gospel account of our Lord's words as He sat on Mount Olivet and looked toward Jerusalem.[22] As we have already seen, the reference to reading is to the public liturgical reading of Scripture. This parenthetical admonition is addressed to the public reader.

This idea of an official reader appears repeatedly in the Apocalypse. Thus we have: "Blessed is he that read-

[19] I Tim. 5: 18.
[20] Deut. 25: 4.
[21] Luke 10: 7.
[22] Matt. 24: 15; Mark 13: 14.

eth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy" (1: 3). The Apocalypse claims to be prophecy in the same sense as belongs to the Old Testament prophets. This claim is confirmed by the words of the angel in St. John's vision: "Forbear! I am a fellow servant with thee and with thy brethren, who bear witness to Jesus: God shalt thou worship. For the witness to Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." [23] The book is to be read on a par with the Old Testament in the public assemblies. Again: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches." [24] This sentence concludes the message to each of the seven churches. From the fact that the Apocalypse was read in the public assemblies of the Christians, we rightly infer that the same practice prevailed in the use of other New Testament writings.

This inference is strengthened when we read the Apostolic epistles. Their authors expect them to be read publicly. Most of them are, as we see from their form of address, community letters which their writers intended should be read publicly. For how should these letters become known to the individual members if they were not read publicly? And where should they be read publicly, if not in the liturgical assemblies?

In St. Paul's First Epistle to the Thessalonians, we read: "I adjure you by the Lord that this letter be read to all the brethren." [25] In his letter to the Colossians, he writes: "When this epistle hath been read before you, see that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans,

[23] Apoc. 19: 10; cf. 22: 7, 10, 18, 19.
[24] Apoc. 2: 7.
[25] I Thess. 5: 27.

and that yourselves read my epistle to Laodicea." [26] Some scholars maintain that St. Paul wrote a special letter to the Laodiceans. Others hold that the letter here referred to is his Epistle to the Ephesians, and that it was a circular letter to be sent from Laodicea to Colossae. In the event of either opinion, the passage shows the early practice of publicly reading the Apostolic letters. It also offers us a glimpse of the practice of copying these letters and the formation of collections of them.

That St. Paul's Epistles were commonly read in public appears from the following passage in St. Peter's Second Epistle: "Our beloved brother Paul also hath written to you . . . even as he doth in all his epistles . . . wherein are some things hard to understand, which the ignorant and unstable wrest to their own destruction, as they do also the rest of the Scriptures." [27] As further evidence that the Apostolic epistles were written for public reading, we cite two sentences from St. Paul: "For we write naught else to you save what ye read." [28] "If anyone obeyeth not what we say by this letter, take note of him, and hold no intercourse with him, in order that he may be ashamed." [29]

If now we hold that Christians were supposed to know exactly "what was written," and if in St. Paul's letters there are many things "hard to understand," we may justly conclude that Christians would not be satisfied with one reading of these letters. Further, if these letters were read repeatedly in the liturgy, they would

[26] Col. 4: 15 f.
[27] II Pet. 3: 15 f.
[28] II Cor. 1: 13.
[29] II Thess. 3: 14.

more and more assume the same standing as the Old Testament writings. This higher standing would in turn strengthen the practice of reading the new writings. Moreover, let us note these two points: each successive generation of Christians was farther removed in time from the traditional words and deeds of the Lord and His Apostles; secondly, the number of persons endowed with charismata, whom St. Paul calls "prophets, apostles, and teachers," gradually grew less. The deep reverence for the New Testament writings and the use of them in the liturgy on a par with the Old Testament, such as we find evidenced in the patristic age, had its beginnings in the Apostolic period.

CHAPTER XV

INSTRUCTION IN COMMON

IN the synagogal liturgy the reading of Scripture was followed by an oral explanation of the passage read and by an exhortation. St. Paul's word to Timothy refers to the same procedure in the Christian liturgy. He says: "Until I come, attend to reading, to exhortation, to teaching." [1] Let us add a few words on this synagogal practice before we examine the Christian practice itself.

In the synagogues two methods were followed in the explanation of Scripture. According to one, the reader himself interpreted what he had just read. An illustration of this practice is given by our Lord in the synagogue of Nazareth.[2] According to the other method, one person read the scriptural passage, and another explained its meaning. In later developments the person who gave the explanation did not always restrict himself to the text just read. This tendency of the explanation to go beyond a mere exegesis of the text led to the "sermon" as an independent element of synagogal worship. The sermon in this sense could also be entirely sepa-

[1] I Tim. 4: 13.
[2] Luke 4: 17–30.

rated from the liturgy and held even outside the synagogue.

Any member of the congregation, regardless of social standing or birth, might be invited to interpret the passage of Scripture.[3] In other New Testament texts we find evidence of the same practice. When Paul and Barnabas came to Antioch in Pisidia and entered into the synagogue and sat down, although they were strangers, they were invited to address the congregation.[4] St. Paul, in his journeys, upon reaching a new town, generally went first to the local synagogue and there addressed the assembled Jews.[5]

Thus we see the place of oral instruction in the liturgy of the synagogue. Naturally the early Christian liturgy adopted this element, developed it, and gave it increasing importance. Therefore we interpret as referring to oral instruction in the liturgical assemblies the following expression in the Acts of the Apostles: "They persevered in the teaching of the Apostles." [6] In the same sense we should understand the phrase "the word of God" as found in the Apostles' justification for their establishing the order of deacons. They say: "It is not seemly that we should forsake the word of God and minister at tables." [7] Likewise when they add, "we shall devote ourselves to prayer and the ministry of the word," they are referring to liturgical prayer and to liturgical preaching. Besides this phrase, "the ministry of the

[3] Luke 4: 20.
[4] Acts 13: 14 f.
[5] Acts 9: 20; 14: 1; 17: 2, 10, 17; 18: 4; 19: 8.
[6] Acts 2: 42.
[7] Acts 6: 4.

word," we find other expressions which imply the practice of liturgical preaching. Thus we have: "the word of God"; [8] "the words of God"; [9] "the oracles of God"; [10] "the word of the Lord"; [11] "the word of salvation"; [12] "the word of grace"; [13] "the word of the gospel"; [14] "the word of the cross." [15] In the same sense must be understood other passages: "In Him are ye too, who have heard the word of truth, the glad tidings of your salvation"; [16] "We beseech and exhort you in the Lord Jesus, that . . . ye abound still more. For ye know what precepts we gave you by authority of the Lord Jesus." [17]

Can we say that these two oral elements, namely, instruction and exhortation, are distinct from each other? We find texts which at first sight seem to imply this distinction. In I Cor. 12: 8, we read: "To one through the Spirit is granted utterance of wisdom; to another utterance of knowledge, according to the same Spirit." Let us note that in the same epistle St. Paul contrasts his own "wisdom" with the "knowledge" which the Corinthians possess. From these passages, especially in the light of the question that arose regarding Apollo's preaching and that of Paul, we might conclude that "utterance of wisdom" signifies simple presentation of Christian truth, and that "utterance of knowledge" signifies a

[8] Acts 4: 31; Rom. 9: 6; Col. 1: 25.
[9] Rom. 3: 4.
[10] Rom. 3: 2.
[11] Acts 8: 25; 13: 48 f.
[12] Acts 13: 26.
[13] Acts 14: 3; 20: 32.
[14] Acts 15: 7.
[15] I Cor. 1: 18.
[16] Eph. 1: 13.
[17] I Thess. 4: 1 f.

presentation of doctrine which is more profound, speculative, and brilliant. We may here add the word of St. Paul in I Cor. 13: 8, that "knowledge" is one of the charismata that will pass away; whereas "wisdom" is not enumerated among these transient charismata.

But deeper investigation shows that instruction and exhortation should not be regarded as really distinct, but as two aspects of the same thing. St. Paul says: "Mere knowledge puffeth up, while charity edifieth. If anyone thinketh that he knoweth anything, he hath not yet come to know as he ought to know; but if anyone love God, the same is known to God." [18] The much more probable view is that instruction naturally ended on a note of exhortation. Such had been the practice of the synagogue. The only distinction which we can clearly find in the New Testament is that between the usual kind of instruction, which was given by the scribes in the synagogues, and a form of instruction accompanied by charismata. This latter form will be discussed in the next chapter.

What were the favorite themes of early Christian sermons? St. Paul's phrases, "the word of the Lord," "the word of salvation," "the word of the cross," give the answer. These themes were developed by showing that the promises made to the fathers were fulfilled in Christ and the cross of Christ. This development proceeded in the same manner whether the sermon was preached in a synagogue, in other places of prayer, in a school, or in a Christian house. Let us note two examples: one, the sermon by St. Peter on the first Pentecost;

[18] I Cor. 8: 2 f.; cf. 13: 2; Gal. 4: 9.

the other, by St. Paul at Antioch in Pisidia. St. Peter says: "Be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ unto the forgiveness of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For to you is the promise and to your children, and to all that are afar, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call to Him." [19] St. Paul says: "To us the word of this salvation hath been sent forth. For the dwellers in Jerusalem and their rulers, not knowing Jesus, nor yet the utterances of the prophets which are read every Sabbath, fulfilled them by condemning Him." [20]

In the Acts of the Apostles we have, in two instances, reference to the theme of St. Paul's preaching. To the Gentile converts in Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch (in Asia Minor), he preached that "through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God." [21] The Apostle's sermon in the Areopagus at Athens is reported at considerable length in chapter 17, verses 22–31. His main themes are the creation of the world and the resurrection of Christ. This subject matter of St. Paul's preaching was well suited to the monotheistic tendencies then prevalent in the Hellenistic world, especially among the philosophers of the time. Whereas at Jerusalem the Sanhedrin condemned the Apostles for preaching Jesus as the Messias,[22] the pagan philosophers at Athens felt that the new element in St. Paul's preaching was the idea of the resurrection.[23]

19 Acts 2: 38 f.
20 Acts 13: 16 f.
21 Acts 14: 22 f.
22 Acts 5: 28.
23 Acts 17: 18, 32.

Throughout St. Paul's missionary career, his favorite topic, as evidenced by his own letters, was the mystery of Christ crucified. Thus to the Corinthians he says: "For I resolved to know nought among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." [24] "Christ hath not sent me to baptize, but to preach the gospel, not indeed with the utterance of wisdom, lest the cross of Christ become void." [25] This last sentence has, by certain scholars, been interpreted wrongly as implying a depreciation of the liturgy.[26]

The chief example of this favorite subject of his is found in chapters 5 and 6 of his Epistle to the Romans. A reading of these chapters prompts us to accept the conclusion of Deissmann,[27] who says: "Early Christianity was not, properly speaking, a religion of redemption, but a liturgy of redemption. However strange such an assertion is to modern ears, it is still true. As liturgy, Christianity conquered the world." And of this liturgy the preaching of St. Paul was the chief propagator. St. Paul in his final development far transcended Hellenistic wisdom. In I Cor. 1: 22–25, he sums up his gospel in these words: "The Jews demand signs, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumblingblock, and to the Gentiles folly, but to those who are called, whether Jew or Greek, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the folly of God is wiser than men, and stronger than men is His weakness."

[24] I Cor. 2: 2.
[25] I Cor. 1: 17.
[26] E. g., Lietzmann, *An die Korinther,* 1923, p. 8.
[27] *Licht vom Osten,* p. 432.

The sermons of St. Paul, in some passages, have human qualities which we should note. In argumentation his style is that of rabbinical exegesis. Again, his language is not the simple and popular language which our Lord employed in His parables of the kingdom of God and in His familiar teaching about the Father in heaven. Lastly, we find in St. Paul, as elsewhere in the New Testament,[28] tendencies to the artificial style which later prevailed in Christian preaching. Whatever dangers may have lurked in these three qualities, in St. Paul's case they were avoided by the strength of his religious personality, by his glowing devotion to the crucified and glorified Lord, and by his genuine and unselfish endeavor to become all things to all men.

Many passages in the New Testament Epistles are echoes of oral instructions. But we find also letters which are substitutes for sermons. Special attention must be given to those letters which have the character of a homily, which seem to reproduce oral preaching. These letters furnish us with a genuine picture of primitive Christian sermons.

We must first note a development in the Greek literature of that time. The older dialogue form had been replaced by a continuous presentation of a subject, known as the diatribe. The Fourth Book of Machabees (apocryphal) is a striking illustration.

Of the New Testament writings the main part of St. Peter's first Epistle is evidently to some extent a reproduction of a sermon that had been preached in connection with Christian baptism. If we accept this

28 Chiefly the Epistle to the Hebrews.

supposition, we find, in the main portion of the Epistle (1: 3—4: 11), that the treatment has more unity and continuity, that the figures and examples are more plastic, and that certain phrases, which otherwise might sound harsh, become smooth and readily fit into the context.

St. James' Epistle also can best be understood as an early Christian oral exhortation. In fact, it seems to contain three such sermons, connected by merely verbal transition rather than by a close relationship of the thought.

The Epistle to the Hebrews can likewise be described as a sermon that has been turned into a letter. Let us note, for example, the phrase "word of exhortation," which is the technical term for the oral instruction in the synagogue service: "But I exhort you, brethren, bear with the word of exhortation, for I have written but briefly to you." [29]

In many of the epistles, categories of persons are mentioned (e. g., young and old, men and women, masters and slaves). This practice must be that of the earliest Christian preachers.[30]

Up to this point we have been considering the evidence which shows that oral teaching, that is, preaching, was a part of the liturgy. Now the question arises, who were the authorized preachers. Of course the authority of the Apostles (the Twelve) may be taken for granted. In I Cor. 12: 28, we read: "God hath appointed sundry persons in the Church, first apostles, secondly

[29] Heb. 13: 22.

[30] See especially the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, I Peter, I Timothy.

prophets, thirdly teachers." These three classes are likewise mentioned, together with others, in Ephesians 4: 11: "Himself gave some as apostles, some as prophets, some as evangelists, some as shepherds and teachers." In its historical narrative the Acts of the Apostles enumerates two classes: "Now there were at Antioch, in the church which was there, prophets and teachers." [31] In this text we have these prophets and teachers performing liturgical functions, as evidenced by the immediate context which says: "They were ministering to the Lord."

The qualities which the early Christians looked for in their teachers are best set forth in the words of instruction addressed by St. Paul to Titus and Timothy, where he enumerates the qualities of a good bishop. To Titus he says: "Show thyself an example of good works, with sincerity, reverence, and sound, unimpeachable discourse in thy teaching, in order that our adversaries may be ashamed, having nothing evil to say against us." [32] To Timothy: "Preach the word, be urgent in season and out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and instruction. . . . Do thou be sober in all things, suffer hardship, do the work of evangelizing, fulfil thy ministry." [33]

At the time of the Apostolic council in Jerusalem, differences were discussed and settled in public assemblies.[34] St. Paul himself indicates that in the Church of the Corinthians each Christian exercised full liberty

31 Acts 13: 1.
32 Titus 2: 7 f.
33 II Tim. 4: 1 f.
34 Acts, chap. 15; cf. Gal. 2: 11 ff.

to address the assembled faithful. He says: "When you come together, each one hath his own gifts—a canticle, an instruction, a revelation, a tongue, an interpretation: well, let everything be done unto edification." [35] This freedom was later restricted by regulations as we see evidenced in the following two passages. "For there will come a time when men will not endure the sound doctrine, but following their own lusts will heap up to themselves teachers, to tickle their ears, and while refusing to listen to the truth, they will turn aside unto fables." [36] "Know how to conduct thyself in the household of God, which is the very church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth." [37]

We must note that in St. Paul's mind the phrase "the pillar and the ground of the truth" connotes oral instruction as a part of divine liturgical worship. This same view should be kept in mind when we read St. Peter's Epistles. Thus many passages will have a new and more correct significance for us; for example, "We have the word of prophecy, firmer still, whereto you do well to give heed, as to a lamp shining in a darksome place, till the day break and the morning star arise in your hearts." [38] "This is the word of the gospel, which was preached unto you. Wherefore . . . like new-born babes, yearn for uncontaminated spiritual milk, that thereon ye may grow unto salvation, if so be that ye have tasted that the Lord is good." [39]

[35] I Cor. 14: 26.
[36] II Tim. 4: 3 f.
[37] I Tim. 3: 15.
[38] II Pet. 1: 19, cf. Heb. 10: 25.
[39] I Pet. 2: 2.

The principle that underlay this liturgical instruction is expressed by St. Paul in the following words: "How are they to call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in Him whom they have not heard? And how are they to hear without a preacher?" [40] As the number of the faithful increased and the opposition on the part of false teachers likewise increased, this principle would be insisted on still more. It led to brief formulas which we may look upon as the beginnings of symbols of faith. Thus in I Tim. 3: 16, we read: "He was manifested in flesh, justified in spirit, seen by angels; was preached among the nations, believed on in the world, taken up in glory." And again: [41] "There is one God, one mediator also between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all men, bearing in due season His witness." In this same Epistle,[42] St. Paul says: "I charge thee . . . before Christ Jesus who bore witness under Pontius Pilate, a good confession, that thou keep the commandment unsullied and without reproach until the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ; which at His own time the blessed and only Sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords, shall display, who alone hath immortality, dwelling in light inaccessible, whom no man hath seen or can see, to whom be honor and everlasting power. Amen." And again: "Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am first. . . . To the King

[40] Rom. 10: 14.
[41] I Tim. 2: 5 f.
[42] I Tim. 6: 13–16.

of the ages, immortal, invisiblè, the only God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen." [43]

Justin Martyr writes as follows: "On the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray." [44] What St. Justin (*cir.* 155) here sets forth in considerable detail, parallels our findings in the New Testament writings, which make mention of reading of Scripture, preaching, confession of faith, and prayer.

[43] I Tim. 1: 15.
[44] *Apol.*, I, 67 (Migne, *PG*, VI, 429).

CHAPTER XVI

THE GIFTS OF PROPHECY AND TONGUES

THE GIFT OF PROPHECY

ORAL instruction consisting of interpretation of Scripture and the repeated insistence upon formulas of faith became increasingly important in Apostolic times. During this same period another element of the liturgical instruction, which had been very important at the beginning, gradually disappeared. We refer to the gift of prophecy.

The various meanings of the word "prophecy" in the New Testament are well illustrated in the following sentences taken from the writings of St. Paul. "Make then charity your aim, yet covet too the spiritual gifts, and especially the gift of prophecy. For he that speaketh in a tongue, speaketh not to men but to God; for none understandeth, though he is speaking mysteries in the spirit. But he that prophesieth speaketh to men words of edification and encouragement and consolation." [1] In this passage "prophecy" signifies speaking by the impulse of the spirit, words of edification and consola-

[1] I Cor. 14: 1–3.

tion to men. "If all be prophesying, and some unbeliever or *idiotes* person enter, he is convicted by all, he is put on trial by all, the secrets of his heart are laid bare." [2] Here "prophecy" means the power of reading men's hearts.

We have evidence of St. Paul's esteem for this gift in several passages where he mentions prophets in the same breath with Apostles and teachers.[3]

Underlying these specific meanings of the expression, is a sense which they have in common. In the New Testament "to prophesy" is always equivalent to "speaking in the spirit." St. Paul distinguishes between the "carnal" [4] man and the "spiritual" [5] man. The carnal man does not understand the teaching of the Spirit of God.[6] But the spiritual man "exploreth all things," even the mysteries of God.[7] Further, in St. Paul's terminology, every Christian is a spiritual man. "He that rejecteth the call rejecteth not man, but God, who giveth unto you His Holy Spirit." [8] Consequently every Christian is able to explore the mysteries of God and to expound them intelligibly.[9]

Is the gift of prophecy a distinctively Christian privilege? We must distinguish. Often we hear the view expressed, that prophecy had ceased in Israel. Those who

[2] I Cor. 14: 24.

[3] Cf. I Cor. 12: 28; Eph. 2: 20; 3: 5; 4: 11. Note also Acts 13: 1, where we read: "Now there were at Antioch, in the Church which was there, prophets and teachers."

[4] "Ανθρωπος ψυχικός.

[5] "Ανθρωπος πνευματικός.

[6] I Cor. 2: 14.

[7] I Cor. 2: 10.

[8] I Thess. 4: 8; cf. I Cor. 3: 16; 6: 17; Rom. 8: 9; 12: 11.

[9] Cf. I Cor. 2: 13–16.

hold this opinion regard it as confirmed by such passages as Matt. 11: 13: "All the prophets and the Law prophesied until John." [10] But this view is refuted by many other passages in the New Testament. John the Baptist was asked, by an official commission sent to him from Jerusalem, whether he was the prophet.[11] In the account of the presentation in the Temple, Anna is called a prophetess.[12] In connection with Herod Antipas' question about the identity of Jesus, we are told that some of those about the King said that Jesus was Elias or one of the prophets.[13] On the occasion of the popular acclaim of our Lord in Jerusalem, some of the people said: "This is Jesus the prophet, from Nazareth of Galilee." [14] Further, we find various warnings against false prophets.[15] All these passages indicate that in our Lord's time the Jews believed that certain men were to be regarded as prophets. They also believed that in the days of the Messias the plenitude of the divine Spirit would be poured out on all flesh and that in the latter days all men would be prophets. Although prophecy was an exceptional phenomenon at this period, the Christians, knowing that Jesus was the Messias, considered that prophecy was a gift bestowed on all of them. Thus St. Peter, in his Pentecost sermon, applies to the Christians the following words of Joel: "I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters

[10] Cf. Zach. 13: 2–6; I Mach. 4: 46; 9: 27; 14: 41.
[11] John 1: 21.
[12] Luke 2: 36.
[13] Mark 6: 14 f.
[14] Matt. 21: 11.
[15] Cf. Matt. 7: 15, 22; 24: 11; I John 4: 1; II Pet. 2: 1.

shall prophesy. . . . And upon My servants indeed, and upon My handmaids will I pour out in those days of My Spirit, and they shall prophesy." [16]

The passages of the New Testament which refer to this possession of the spirit by Christians are very numerous. Of particular importance is a passage in the Fourth Gospel. In the Temple on the feast of Tabernacles, Jesus said: "If any man thirst, let him come to Me, and let him drink. Whoso believeth in me, as the Scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters." [17] The Evangelist interprets these words as follows: "This He said of the Spirit, which they were to receive who believe in Him." [18]

St. John then adds: "For there was not as yet the Spirit, because Jesus was not yet glorified." This sentence calls for explanation. St. John certainly does not mean that no one had yet received the Holy Ghost, for St. Luke speaks of the Blessed Virgin, John the Baptist, Elizabeth, and Zachary as filled with the Holy Ghost.[19] Hence St. John's meaning is that the Holy Spirit has not yet been given in the special manner in which Christians will receive Him after Christ's ascension.[20] When the Spirit comes in this latter sense, He will give to Christians on rare occasions the happiness of being rapt up into heaven, of seeing what man's eye cannot see, and of hearing what man's ear cannot hear. Thus, in a well-known passage, St. Paul speaks of his own rapture into

[16] Acts 2: 17 f.
[17] John 7: 37.
[18] John 7: 39.
[19] Cf. Luke 1: 15, 35, 41, 67.
[20] Cf. John 14: 16 f.; Acts 1: 4; 2: 33.

the third heaven.[21] Another such instance is that of St. Stephen at the time of his martyrdom. "Being full of the Holy Ghost, he looked up to heaven and saw the glory of God." [22] St. Paul, speaking of all Christians, says: "To us God hath revealed it through the Spirit, for the Spirit, exploreth all things, even the deep things of God." [23] Christians, thus knowing the things of God, are able to interpret them intelligibly to others.[24]

The gift of prophecy, then, is the fruit of incorporation in Christ. At first this gift was accompanied by external signs. In the account of St. Paul's visit to Ephesus, we are told that certain disciples "were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; and when Paul laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke in tongues and prophesied." [25] When these signs gradually became less frequent, the office of teacher and preacher became relatively more and more important.

We must again insist that this gift of prophecy just spoken of is not to be confounded with prophecy in the sense of foretelling the future. In this latter sense, prophecy in the New Testament is seldom mentioned and is not a matter of great moment. We find references to it in the following instances: Agabus in Antioch foretold a famine; [26] on another occasion he foretold the imprisonment of Paul; [27] the daughters of the deacon Philip

[21] II Cor. 12: 2–5.
[22] Acts 7: 55.
[23] I Cor. 2: 10.
[24] Cf. I Cor. 2: 13.
[25] Acts 19: 5 f.; cf. 1: 4–8; 2: 1–21; 10: 44–48; 8: 17.
[26] Acts 11: 28.
[27] Acts 21: 11.

prophesied, perhaps in this sense of the word,[28] the warning to Paul, that he should not go to Jerusalem.[29]

The Christian community at the outset very strongly experienced the life and power of the Spirit. Hence also prophecy enjoyed a privileged place in Christian life and liturgy. It was especially esteemed by the Apostle Paul. After his conversion, by a revelation of God, he often enjoyed direct inspirations, visions, and illuminations.[30] Feeling himself in certain possession of the gifts of the Spirit, he does not hesitate to say, "I think that I also have the spirit of God." [31] Further, he considers this gift an essential trait of Christianity. He defends his converts against false accusers in Jerusalem by insisting that these converts had also received the Spirit. Still he claims that the Spirit of God rests on himself in a special manner since he is an Apostle.[32]

Three chapters (12–14) of St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians are noteworthy for our present consideration. Apparently the entire epistle was written in answer to questions addressed to him by the Christian community at Corinth. These three chapters seem to be a reply to some question about the discrimination between good and evil spirits. Hence St. Paul begins by laying down a principle of discernment. "I give you to understand that no one speaking by the Spirit of God saith, 'Anathema be Jesus'; and no one can say, 'Jesus is Lord,' save in the Holy Spirit."

[28] Acts 21: 8.
[29] Acts 21: 4.
[30] Acts 16: 6–10; II Cor. 12: 1–5; Gal. 2: 2.
[31] I Cor. 7: 40.
[32] Acts 21 :10–14; Rom. 15: 19; I Cor.. 2: 4, 7; 7: 40; 14 :37 f.; II Cor. 12: 12.

As we see in the Gospel, any extraordinary phenomenon was attributed to spirits, either good or evil. Thus we read that our Lord's miracles were ascribed by His enemies to the power of evil spirits, even to Beelzebub the prince of devils.[33]

St. Paul, in his answer to the Corinthians, implicitly accepts this attitude. Not satisfied with merely answering their question, he proceeds to instruct them about the various gifts of the Spirit, specifically about the pre-eminence of the gift of prophecy. After enumerating the different gifts, he concludes by saying: "All these are the work of one and the same Spirit, who apportioneth severally to each as He will" (12: 11). Apparently the Corinthians had been of the opinion that all Christians are expected to be recipients of all the gifts, and that among these the gift of tongues was to be regarded as pre-eminent. Against this idea, St. Paul adduces an analogy between the body with its members and the community with its various gifts. He then at some length sets forth the superiority of charity. "Make then charity your aim, yet covet too the spiritual gifts, and especially the gift of prophecy" (14: 1).

In chapter fourteen St. Paul sets forth in detail the superiority of the gift of prophecy over the gift of tongues. "He that prophesieth speaketh to men words of edification and encouragement and consolation. He that speaketh in a tongue edifieth himself; he that prophesieth edifieth the Church. I would have you all to speak in tongues, but still more to prophesy." "Wherein shall I profit you, unless I utter something to you, either

[33] Mark 3: 22.

by way of revelation or of knowledge or of prophesying or of teaching?" "Wherefore the gift of tongues is meant for a sign, not to believers, but to unbelievers; prophecy, on the other hand, for a sign not to unbelievers, but to believers."

The chapter concludes with practical rules for controlling the exercise of the gift of prophecy in liturgical assemblies. "Of the prophets let two or three speak at each meeting, and the rest discern; but if another that is seated receive a revelation, let the first speaker be silent. Ye can thus all prophesy one after another, that all may be instructed and all may be comforted. For prophetic gifts are under the control of prophets; God is not a God of disorder, but of peace. And even so it is done in all the churches of the saints. . . . If anyone think himself a prophet or spiritually gifted, let him clearly recognize that what I am writing to you is a commandment of the Lord; but if anyone know not this, himself is unknown of the Lord. Wherefore, my brethren, covet the gift of prophesying, and forbid not speaking in tongues; but let all things be done becomingly and in order."

We may now summarize this long exposition. In St. Paul's usage the word "prophet" still has its original meaning, namely, the interpreter of divine speech. The prophet is in immediate rapport with God, brings back divine messages which he then interprets to the assembly. The assembly in turn has the faculty of distinguishing what sort of spirit speaks out of the prophet, and the prophet is obliged to yield to their judgment in this question.

Hence in genuine Christian prophecy we have two elements: one divine, the other human. In its divine element the prophecy is subject to the law of love and order. In its human element it is subject to the prophet's own mind and will. Prophecy, then, we may say, arises from a state of rapture; but in its exercise it is dependent on the will of the prophet.

Thus the exercise of this gift is not beyond the prophet's control. Otherwise he could not be silent when another prophet rises to speak. Here in this element lies the danger of self-deception. This danger we may express in St. Paul's words to the Thessalonians: "Spurn not prophesyings; but test all things; hold fast the good." [34] Further we have the words of St. John: "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God, because many false prophets are gone forth into the world. Hereby ye know the spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is of God, and every spirit that doth not confess Jesus, is not of God: it is the spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is already in the world." [35]

In St. John's words just quoted, we see that he sets up a Christological criterion for distinguishing the true from the false prophets. The letters of St. John, which come toward the close of the Apostolic period, illustrate the transition from the regime of prophecy to that of the teaching office based on the preaching of the Apostles and Apostolic tradition. But at a much earlier date

[34] I Thess. 5: 20.
[35] I John 4: 1–3.

we find St. Paul insisting on the value of prophecy and also on Apostolic traditions. Thus he says: ". . . that with all wisdom ye teach and admonish one another." [36] And again: "Stand firm and hold fast the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by our word or by our letter." [37]

Thus we see how prophecy like other gifts of the Spirit is subordinated to the oral preaching of the Gospel and to the traditions of the elders. In illustration of the former we refer the reader to the anathema pronounced by St. Paul against any man who "preacheth a gospel other than that ye have received." [38] Illustrating the eminent position held by tradition, the epistles to Timothy may be cited. "Thou wilt be a good minister of Christ Jesus, imbued with the words of the faith and of the good doctrine which thou hast learnt." [39] "Abide in those things wherein thou hast been instructed and convinced, mindful from whom thou didst learn them." [40] "Hold to the pattern of sound words which thou didst hear from me. . . . Guard the good deposit, through the Holy Spirit who dwelleth in us." [41] In the original Greek text, the expression (ὑποτύπωσις) which we here render "pattern" denotes an authoritative outline, which in later usage would be called a creed.

As we have seen above that private prayer tended to

[36] Col. 3: 16.
[37] II Thess. 2: 16.
[38] Gal. 1: 9.
[39] I Tim. 4: 6.
[40] II Tim. 3: 14.
[41] II Tim. 1: 13 f.

merge into liturgical prayer, so here we see that the personal gift of prophecy gradually gives way to authoritative teaching based on the preaching of the Gospel and on tradition. On the one hand, St. Paul emphasizes the value of the gift of prophecy, second in importance only to the Apostolic office. "This mystery of Christ, which was not made known to other generations of the sons of men, as now it hath been made known to His holy apostles and prophets." [42] "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets." [43] "Prophets" in this context refers, not to the prophets of the Old Law, but to the Christian prophets, in the sense repeatedly used by St. Paul. On the other hand, St. Paul himself subordinates the gift of prophecy to the Spirit that speaks primarily by the gospel and tradition.

Thus we see that the early spontaneous and enthusiastic manifestation of the gift of prophecy was guided by St. Paul into the restraint of charity and order. The importance of this service which St. Paul rendered to Christian liturgy will become more evident from our discussion of the gift of tongues in the following pages.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES

The Greek word *glossa,* which we translate "tongue," has three meanings: the organ of speech, language, and an ancient and sacred saying. None of these meanings suffices to explain the sense which the word has in the

[42] Eph. 3: 5.
[43] Eph. 2: 20.

writings of St. Paul. To ascertain his meaning, we need to consider the various phrases in which the word occurs and the descriptive details which he adds.

In chapters 12, 13, and 14 of First Corinthians, we find the following expressions: "kinds of tongues," "to speak in tongues," "tongues," "to speak in a tongue," "to utter a word with the tongue," "to pray with the tongue," "to speak words in a tongue," "to have a tongue."

In the same Epistle we find the following descriptive details. "Speaking in tongues" means to pray or sing or give thanks in the Holy Ghost.[44] Again it means the utterance of words not then understood by the speaker himself.[45] Again it means speech intended, not for men, but for God.[46] Or speech profitable to the speaker's edification, but not to that of the community,[47] which needs a special gift of interpretation for an understanding of the message.[48] Again "speaking in tongues" may also mean something mysterious and overwhelming, expressed by the term "speaking into the air." [49] Hence the use of the gift of tongues may make the speaker seem to be a barbarian or a person out of his mind; [50] and it is compared to playing on musical instruments which produce only a confused sound or to a meaningless trumpet blast or to unintelligible speech or to speech in

[44] I Cor. 14: 14.
[45] I Cor. 14: 19.
[46] I Cor. 14: 2, 28.
[47] I Cor. 14: 4, 6.
[48] I Cor. 12: 10, 30; 14: 5, 27.
[49] I Cor. 14: 9.
[50] I Cor. 14: 11, 24.

an unknown language.[51] Summarizing these details, we may say that the gift of tongues is a sort of ecstatic speech with stammering, abrupt, and unintelligible sounds.

From these comparisons we may draw certain conclusions. First, "speaking in tongues" is not the same as speaking in a foreign language. The fact that St. Paul contrasts it to speaking in a foreign tongue implies that it is not itself a foreign speech. The same inference may be drawn from the fact that those who spoke in tongues were not understood by anyone present.

A second conclusion is this: "speaking in tongues" is not the same as using highly lyrical language. Otherwise some of these present would have been able to understand. For the same reason it cannot have the meaning of ancient oracular utterances, at least in the sense of the pagan oracles. But it may have the meaning of a sacred oracle. For it is a language which is understood by God and perhaps by the angels.[52] Summarizing, we may say that "speaking in tongues" is a manner of conversing with God without the human hearers understanding. It is an attempt to express in new and heavenly language what the speaker has experienced but cannot intelligibly express in words.

Does St. Paul's expression, "kinds of tongues," as also "speaking in tongues," imply that the gift of tongues was manifold? In I Cor. 14: 13–17, he uses these expressions: "I pray in a tongue," "I will sing with my spirit," "if thou bless God in spirit alone, how shall the hearer

[51] I Cor. 14: 7–12.
[52] Cf. I Cor. 13: 1.

say Amen to thy thanksgiving?" May we say, then, that we have here reference to a multiform gift? Probably such a meaning is not to be inferred. These expressions are used also of usual forms of prayer that are not ecstatic. Hence we may conclude that the term "kinds of tongues" was a usual designation of the gift.[53]

The "speaking in tongues" was a form of prayer rather than a form of instruction. Those who have the gift of tongues are mentioned with the prophets only when the gift of interpretation is available at the same time. This gift of interpretation of tongues, namely, the faculty to distinguish what sort of spirit is speaking through the persons having the gift, is absolutely necessary for an understanding of that mysterious, stammering form of utterance, which itself is unintelligible.

This obscurity is the reason why St. Paul esteems the gift of tongues less highly than the gift of prophecy. He says: "In church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, so as to instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue." [54] Still we must remember that St. Paul did highly esteem the gift of tongues. But his instructions regarding this gift show that he considered it rather a gift of prayer than a gift of instruction. Thus he says: "Let him that speaketh in a tongue pray that he may interpret as well." [55] If, then, the gift is one of prayer rather than one of instruction, we may understand why St. Paul restricts its free exercise to private prayer and allows it to be used in the liturgical assem-

[53] Cf. I Cor. 12: 10, 28.
[54] I Cor. 14: 19.
[55] I Cor. 14: 13.

blies only within certain limits. For he says: "If anyone speaketh in a tongue, let there be no more than two, or at the most three, at a time, and each in turn, and let one man be interpreter. But if there be no interpreter, let him so gifted be silent in church, speaking only to himself and to God." [56]

The exercise of this gift of tongues was not without certain dangers. These arose partly from the enthusiastic conviction of early Christians that they were fulfilling the Old Testament prophecies, partly from the exaggerated esteem with which this gift was regarded by newly converted Gentiles. Along this road the ethical element might be eclipsed by the ecstatic element. The danger was met in principle by St. Paul, who wrote: "Ye know that once ye were Gentiles, carried away to the worship of dumb idols, according as ye chanced to be led. Wherefore I give you to understand that no one speaking by the Spirit of God saith 'Anathema' to Jesus; and no one can say 'Jesus is Lord,' save in the Holy Spirit." [57]

From chapters 12–14 of the First Epistle to the Corinthians we see that not all Christians thought as St. Paul did. The rules for discernment of spirits in incidents like that referred to in the text just quoted [58] evidently imply that lying prophets and deceitful spirits were at work in primitive Christianity. Other New Testament incidents show the danger of cultivating the charismatic element at the expense of the moral. As ex-

[56] I Cor. 14: 27 f.
[57] I Cor. 12: 2 f.
[58] Cf. I Cor. 2: 11; Eph. 2: 2; II Thess. 2: 2.

amples of such occasions we mention the controversy between St. Peter and Simon Magus,[59] that between St. Paul and Elymas,[60] and the unsuccessful efforts by the seven sons of the high priest to drive out devils.[61]

At first the gift of tongues was exercised chiefly at the liturgical assemblies, and there consequently the dangers that might arise from its misuse were greatest. Without regulation these assemblies might easily become scenes of senseless excitement and confusion. St. Paul's words show that he was aware of this danger, for he says: "If the whole church be assembled together, and all be speaking in tongues, and if those who are *idiotae* or who are unbelievers enter, will they not say that ye are raving?" [62] The fulness of charismatic gifts in the early Church might easily lead to such scenes. St. Paul's well-known list enumerates utterance of wisdom, utterance of knowledge, faith, gifts of healing, kinds of tongues, interpretation of tongues.[63] Of course each one was eager to exercise his own gift. In I Cor. 14: 26, we read: "When you come together, each one hath his own gift: a canticle, an instruction, a revelation, a tongue, an interpretation."

Bearing in mind the evidence we have just adduced, we can appreciate the full greatness of the Apostle Paul. He himself had the plenitude of all these gifts and exercised them in such a manner that at times he seemed

[59] Acts 8: 14–24.
[60] Acts 13: 6 ff.
[61] Acts 19: 13 ff.
[62] I Cor. 14: 23.
[63] I Cor. 12: 8 ff.

beside himself.[64] Nevertheless in the liturgical assemblies he exercises his Apostolic authority in restraining the use of these gifts within the limits of Christian charity and order. Emphatically he impresses upon the Corinthians the pre-eminence of charity and decorum over all ecstatic manifestations. Charity, the fruit of the spirit,[65] will keep the liturgical assembly from becoming a scene of individual piety and will make these gifts subserve the upbuilding of the whole community. Herein lies the specific trait of Christian liturgy as contrasted with the pagan liturgies. Thus St. Paul preserved the early Church from the perils that lurked in the unrestrained exercise of these ecstatic gifts.

For these reasons the gift of tongues and the gift of prophecy diminished in importance. But in one form they survived. St. Augustine expresses this form of survival in the following passage:

"Let us make a joyful noise unto God our salvation." What is meant by "make a joyful noise"? Not to be able to express one's joy in words, and yet to testify by the voice what has been conceived within, and refuses to be compassed in words; this is to make a joyful noise. Consider, beloved, those who make a joyful noise in any ordinary songs, as in a sort of competition of worldly joy; and you see them while reciting the written lines bursting forth with a joy, that the tongue suffices not to express the measure of; how they shout, indicating by that utterance the feeling of the mind, which cannot in words express what is conceived in the heart. If they then in earthly joy make a

[64] II Cor. 5: 13.
[65] Gal. 5: 22.

joyful noise, may we not do so from heavenly joy, which truly we cannot express in words? [66]

Köstlin [67] refers to these words of St. Augustine as expressing the spirit of the jubilus in Gregorian chant. The jubilus is the spontaneous outburst with which the alleluia melody ends.

[66] Migne, *PL,* XXVII, 1218. The above passage is according to the Oxford translation.

[67] *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes,* 1887, p. 18.

CHAPTER XVII

THE SINGING OF PSALMS AND HYMNS

WE have seen how the gift of prophecy and the gift of tongues gradually became less conspicuous and were subordinated to order and charity. We have likewise seen, from what St. Augustine says, that the gift of tongues was superseded by an increasing use of psalmody. This line of development is foreshadowed in St. Paul's words. Whereas, on the one hand, he stringently limits the exercise of the gift of tongues, yet he does not set down any limits to the expression of Christian sentiment in psalms and hymns. "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is luxury; but be ye filled with the Holy Spirit, speaking to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord." [1]

Let us give a brief survey of the history of sacred song among the Jews. In the book of Job [2] we read: "The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Isaias [3] gives us the "Holy, holy, holy"

[1] Eph. 5: 18 f.
[2] Job. 38: 7.
[3] Is. 6: 3.

which the angels sing before the throne of God. Very early in Jewish history we have the song of triumph which Moses sang with the Israelites after they had safely passed through the Red Sea.[4] Moses, shortly before his death, sang the canticle of Deuteronomy.[5] Among the singers of Israel are mentioned Moses' sister Miriam,[6] Debbora and Barac,[7] Samuel's mother Anna,[8] Ezechias,[9] and Daniel.[10]

The expression "Book of Song" (III Kings 8: 53) may refer to an ancient liturgical song book for use in the Temple. But the most precious heritage which Christianity received from the Jews and still preserves with great reverence is the Psalms. The pre-eminent place held by the psalms in the world's religious literature, according to the opinion expressed by Max Müller,[11] is acknowledged by all unprejudiced critics. The Hebrew psalms, he adds, are unique in their simplicity, their power of thought, and the majesty of their language. These three qualities are found also in the New Testament canticles. We find four of them in the Gospels: the *Magnificat* of Mary (Luke 1: 46–55), the *Benedictus* of Zachary (Luke 1: 68–79), the canticles of Simeon (Luke 2: 29–32) and Anna (Luke 2: 38).

The circumstances under which these canticles are

[4] Ex. 15: 1 ff.
[5] Deut. 32: 1 ff.
[6] Ex. 15: 20.
[7] Judg. 5: 1.
[8] I Kings 2: 1 ff.
[9] Is. 38: 9.
[10] Dan. 2: 20 ff.
[11] *On Ancient Prayers*, p. 40. Quoted from Perles, *Jüdische Skizzen*, p. 154.

recorded justify us in concluding that even in the Temple pious Jews poured out their hearts in spontaneous song. The narrative does not present the canticles of Simeon and Anna as anything unusual. And when the parents of Jesus are in wonder, their wonder is not aroused by the fact that these holy persons thus gave expression to their thoughts in the Temple, but by the amazing contents of their utterances.

These New Testament canticles, particularly the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus,* are closely allied to Old Testament canticles. The *Nunc dimittis* of Simeon, when compared with the *Benedictus,* seems to be more prompted by the circumstances of the occasion. The *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus* preserve the traditional Jewish liturgical forms. These two canticles best illustrate the transition from Old Testament psalmody to New Testament poetry. The resemblance is notable in their form, contents, and divine inspiration.

Hence these two canticles best reveal that enthusiastic religious atmosphere referred to by St. Paul when he urges Christians to be filled with the Spirit and to build up one another with psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles. Christians, being more fully under the dominance of the Holy Spirit,[12] will give expression to their feelings in the manner spoken of by St. Paul.

Let us for a moment recall some expressions used by Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian with reference to liturgical singing in their times. Clement calls the liturgical assembly a *theios choros* (a form of sacred dra-

[12] Acts 2: 14 ff.; Rom. 8: 14; I Cor. 3: 16; II Cor. 6: 16.

matic song).[13] Tertullian, writing of the Christian agape, says: "Each one present is asked to stand forth and sing, as he can, a hymn to God, either one from the Holy Scriptures or one of his own composing." This evidence of religious emotional enthusiasm so widespread in the third century affords us a better appreciation of the significance of New Testament expressions such as "sing psalms," [14] or simply "sing"; [15] "speaking in psalms and hymns," [16] "psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles." [17]

Are the three terms, namely, "psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles," synonymous? From the fact that they are frequently used together,[18] some writers argue that they are not synonymous. On the other hand, Chevalier points out that, even in later times, psalms are sometimes called hymns [19] or spiritual canticles. May we at least say that the term "psalm" means Old Testament psalm? Such is not the case at least in I Cor. 14: 26, where the word "psalm" evidently means a spontaneous utterance composed at the moment. We may, at any rate, say that in the New Testament these terms are synonymous unless the context requires a distinction.

In the New Testament enumeration of "psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles," are we to understand

[13] Clement Alex., *Stromata,* VII, vii, 49; *PG,* IX, 469. Cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum,* VII, 67; *PG,* XI, 1617. Ignatius, *Ad Rom.,* II, 2; *PG,* V, 688.

[14] Rom. 15: 9; I Cor. 14:15; Jas. 5: 13. Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.,* XXXIX, 18 (Migne, *PL,* I, 477).

[15] Col. 3: 16; Apoc. 5: 9; 14: 3; 15: 3.

[16] Eph. 5: 19.

[17] I Cor. 14: 26; Eph. 5: 19; Col. 3: 16; Jas. 5: 13.

[18] Cf. Kayser, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der Kirchenhymnen,* 1868, p. 20.

[19] In the *Liber Pontificalis.*

that the term "hymns" signifies something distinct from psalms and spiritual canticles? In the Septuagint we find that the word *hymnos* ("hymn") generally signifies one of those solemn liturgical canticles not found in the Book of Psalms. However, the Septuagint employs this word also for "psalms" in the strict sense.[20] In the New Testament the verb "to sing hymns" is used with reference to singing Old Testament psalms.[21]

What are we to understand by "spiritual canticles"? May we say that the term designates songs which are not the result of premeditated art, but of immediate inspiration? This latter meaning is possible. It does no violence to the texts where it occurs. But this meaning cannot be established from the texts themselves.

The only distinction which we can establish with certainty is that between the songs taken over from the Old Testament and those recorded in the New Testament as having been spoken by persons filled with the Holy Spirit. In this latter category of songs we find a further distinction indicated by St. Paul,[22] who says: "I will pray with my spirit, I will pray with my understanding also." "Praying and singing with the spirit" signifies charismatic song; "praying and singing with the understanding" signifies non-charismatic song.

The notable elements to be observed in the contents of the New Testament psalms, hymns, and canticles are joy and thanksgiving. This joy is manifested both in private life and in the liturgical assemblies. Thus, for

[20] II Par. 7: 6; cf. II Mach. 1: 30.
[21] Matt. 26: 30.
[22] I Cor. 14: 15.

example, when Paul and Silas were prisoners at Philippi, they were occupied about midnight with singing hymns to God in prayer, while the other prisoners were listening to them.[23] Evidently this was an act of private devotion. An example of the manifestation of joy and thanksgiving as an act of public devotion may be noted in the circumstance mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. After the conversion of the three thousand on Pentecost, "day by day, they persevered with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread in private homes, they took food with joyful simplicity of heart, praising God." [24] We may cite a few other texts to illustrate the deep feeling of joy that pervaded the early Christians. "Is anyone glad at heart? Let him sing hymns." [25] "Joy in the Holy Spirit." [26] St. Peter, in his Pentecost sermon, quoting psalm 15, says: "My heart is glad and my tongue rejoiceth. . . . Thou shalt fill me with gladness at Thy presence." [27]

Expressions of joy and thanksgiving run through the whole New Testament. St. Luke's writings are especially conspicuous for this trait. Thus, for example, he quotes the Blessed Virgin as saying: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior." [28] The Acts of the Apostles relates that the Apostles, after their arrest and release, "went forth from before the council rejoicing that they had been counted worthy

[23] Acts 16: 25.
[24] Acts 2: 46.
[25] Jas. 5: 13.
[26] Rom. 14: 17.
[27] Acts 2: 26, 28; cf. Acts 13: 52; Eph. 5: 18 f.; I Thess. 1: 6.
[28] Luke 1: 47; cf. 1: 14, 44; 2: 10; 10: 17; 13: 17; 24: 41, 52. Cf. esp. John, chaps. 15–17.

to suffer dishonor for the Name." [29] St. Paul urges the Christians whom he is addressing as follows: "Rejoice always, pray without ceasing, in everything give thanks." [30] The same thought is also expressed by St. Peter, who says: "Believing in Him, ye exult with an unspeakable and glorified joy." [31] "We cannot too often repeat this truth, that Christianity won its victory not merely by the persuasiveness of its incomparable doctrine, but rather by the spirit of joy and blessedness which filled the lives of the Apostles and of the ordinary faithful, and especially by the martyrs' readiness to face death." [32]

In this situation, then, even the Old Testament psalms were not adequate to express the Christians' enthusiasm. Hence among Christians new songs and canticles arose. In the Apocalypse the Christians are spoken of as those who sing a new song.[33] In addition to the Old Testament psalms and the Canticle of Moses,[34] Christians sing the song of the Lamb.[35]

We have seen above in chapter 15 that Christian liturgy retained the reading of the Law and the Prophets. We have special reasons for believing that it retained the chanting of the psalms, particularly those that were prophetic of Christ's life and sufferings, of His Messiaship, and of the life and sufferings of His disciples. Thus St. Peter in his Pentecost sermon quotes psalm 15 to

[29] Acts 5: 41. Cf. 8: 8, 39; 11: 18; 13: 48; 15: 3; 16: 34.
[30] Cf. Phil. 4: 4 f.; Jude 24 f.
[31] I Pet. 1: 8.
[32] Joh. Weiss, *Christus,* 1909, p. 9.
[33] Apoc. 5: 9; 14: 3.
[34] Deut. 32: 1 ff.
[35] Apoc. 15: 3.

show that Christ could not be held by death: "Thou wilt not abandon my soul to the grave, nor suffer Thy holy one to see corruption." [36] Even without other evidence, we would know, from the present important place held by the psalms in the Christian liturgy, that their liturgical use must be as old as the Church.

In the singing of the psalms, did the early Christians follow the method of the Temple? No, they followed that of the synagogue. The former was a solemn form accompanied by instruments. The simpler synagogal form was recitative, without accompaniment.

But the Christians' fondness for the Old Testament psalmody did not hinder the development of new spiritual canticles. As evidence of this development, we may note a number of lyrical passages, especially in St. Paul and the Apocalypse. These canticles have retained the balanced structure of Hebrew literature.

Referring to our Lord, St. Paul says:

Who was manifested in the flesh,
Glorified in the spirit,
Seen by angels;
Was preached among the nations,
Was believed in the world,
Was taken up in glory.[37]

This passage seems to be taken from an early Christian hymn. Similarly the following passage:

If we have died with Him, we shall also live with Him:
If we endure, we shall also reign with Him:
If we deny Him, He also will deny us:

[36] Acts 2: 27. Cf. Acts 1: 20; 2: 34; 4: 25.
[37] I Tim. 3: 16.

If we are faithless, He remaineth faithful:
For He cannot deny Himself.[38]

Another lyric passage of especial beauty is that in Eph. 5: 14:

Awake, thou that sleepest,
And arise from the dead,
And Christ shall enlighten thee.

No document has ever been suggested as the source of these words. May we not say that possibly they were taken from an early baptismal hymn? This supposition becomes the more likely if we recall St. Paul's reference to baptism as a burial with Christ and a resurrection with Christ.

Of all the New Testament writings, the Apocalypse has the best claim to be regarded as a book of canticles. We quote one passage:

I heard a loud voice from the throne, saying:
Behold the dwelling of God with men:
And He shall dwell with them;
They shall be His peoples,
And God Himself shall be with them.
And He shall wipe away every tear from their eyes,
And death shall be no more,
Neither shall mourning or wailing or pain be any more,
Because the first things are passed away.[39]

[38] II Tim. 2: 11 ff.

[39] Apoc. 21: 3 f. Cf. 1: 4 ff.; 4: 8 ff.; 5: 9 ff.; 7: 10 ff.; 11: 15 ff.; 12: 10 ff.; 15: 3 f.; 19: 1 ff.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE SACRED BANQUET: THE BREAKING OF BREAD

AT the beginning of Part II we mentioned the truth that the union among the early Christians, referred to by our sources, included also the idea of their meeting together. This practice does not surprise us when we consider the example of their divine Master. St. Luke summarizes this life of union among early Christians:

> They persevered in the teaching of the Apostles and fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers. . . . All they that believed held all things in common; and they used to sell their property and goods and distribute the price among all, according as anyone had need. Day by day they persevered with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread in their houses, they took food with gladness and simplicity of heart, praising God and being in favor with the whole people.[1]

This passage assures us that the faithful gathered not only in the Temple for public prayer, but also in their houses to break bread. Two interpretations of this last

1 Acts 2: 42 ff.

phrase are possible. It may mean that the entire community gathered in a single house, or that they divided into separate groups. This latter interpretation corresponds to Jewish custom; but the former interpretation more closely agrees with later development and with the exact texts of the New Testament. The very context of our present passage favors this view. "Everything in common" is the keynote of the passage.

The texts we have just quoted deal with liturgical assemblies of the first Christians. Assembling for the common breaking of bread thus becomes characteristic of the early Christians. We may strengthen this view by the following consideration. The Temple, even if the Christians had been allowed free access to it, was not suited for Christian liturgical services. Within the Temple there were no rooms which were available for the use of those who believed in Jesus. Hence their domestic places of assembly for the breaking of bread more and more came to be used for their public worship of God.

We must note one particular circumstance in connection with these meals in common. "They took their food," says the account, "in joy and simplicity of heart, praising God." We see here how the early Christians understood the parables of our Lord, which show us the kingdom of God under the image of a joyful banquet,[2] and especially of a marriage banquet.[3] The first Christians reflected the joy expressed by the man who, after our Lord's words about inviting the poor, said:

[2] Luke 12: 37; 13: 29; 22: 29.
[3] Matt. 22: 2; Luke 14: 24; cf. Apoc. 19: 9.

"Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God." [4]

This figure of a joyful banquet we find frequently in the Old Testament books of the prophets, the sapiential books, and the psalms. Isaias, in describing the Messianic reign, says: "The Lord of hosts shall make unto all people in this mountain a feast of fat things, a feast of wine, of fat things full of marrow, of wine purified from the lees." [5] Ecclesiasticus, extolling the value of wisdom, says: "My spirit is sweet above honey, and my inheritance above honey and the honeycomb." [6] In like manner in the Book of Proverbs we read: "Wisdom . . . hath slain her victims, mingled her wine, and set forth her table." [7] This figure as set forth in the psalms is a familiar one. "As the hart panteth after the fountains of water; so my soul panteth after Thee, O God. My soul hath thirsted after the strong living God." [8] "Let my soul be filled as with marrow and fatness: and my mouth shall praise Thee with joyful lips." [9]

The Jews believed that when the Messianic times should come the Messias would provide His people with unfailing bread. Thus the psalmist said: "He rained down manna upon them to eat and gave them the bread of heaven. Man ate the bread of angels." [10] This thought underlies our Lord's promise of the Eucharist in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Jesus, since He gives

[4] Luke 14: 15.
[5] Is. 25: 6; cf. 55: 1 f.; 65: 13.
[6] Ecclus. 24: 27.
[7] Prov. 9: 1 f.
[8] Ps. 41: 2 f.
[9] Ps. 62: 6.
[10] Ps. 77: 25 f.

heavenly bread, is the true Messias. He begins by exhorting His hearers to work for that bread which lasts unto life everlasting,[11] which is heavenly and gives eternal life,[12] but which demands as a presupposition faith in the Messias, that is, in Christ Himself.[13] The Jews are scandalized on hearing that Christ identifies Himself with the Messias and with the heavenly food, since they think that His origin is not heavenly.[14] Christ insists on His previous statement and demands the acknowledgment of His heavenly mission and faith in His person as the indispensable condition for attaining heavenly eternal life.[15] In the words that immediately follow, most exegetes today understand Christ to be speaking of the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood in the literal sense.[16] But for our present purpose, whatever view we adopt on this controverted question, we see clearly that the idea of a common Messianic meal is the starting point and the underlying supposition on which Christ and His hearers are agreed.

The preceding considerations help us to understand why primitive Christian religious assemblies assumed the form of a meal in common. We now turn to the question of the meaning to be given to the phrase "breaking of bread." In the Acts we read: "They persevered in the teaching of the Apostles and fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers. . . . Day by day

11 Ps. 6: 27.
12 Verses 32 f.
13 Verses 34 ff.
14 Verses 41 f.
15 Verses 43 ff.
16 Verses 53 ff. See especially Cavallera, "L'interpretation du ch. VI de St. Jean," in *Revue d'histoire eccl.*, X (1909), 687–709.

they persevered with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread in their houses, they took food with joy and simplicity of heart, praising God and in favor with the whole people." [17]

First of all we note that among the Jews bread is a symbol of nourishment in general, and to eat bread means to partake of a meal. The Gospel, speaking of a meal which our Lord took in the house of a Pharisee, says: "When He went into the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees on a Sabbath to eat bread." [18] Hence to share one's bread with another means to receive him with friendly hospitality. For example, Isaias says: "Deal thy bread to the hungry, bring the needy and the harborless into thy house." [19] The fundamental thought of all Jewish liturgical meals is that of friendly hospitality.[20] The paschal meal is the chief type. And the mere breaking of bread and offering it to a guest is a sign of his being received into the family circle.

This thought of the significance of eating together permeates St. Paul's discussion of the question whether a Christian may partake of food that has been sacrificed to idols. In the heart of this discussion we find the following passage: "We many are one bread, one body, for we all partake of the one bread." [21] Before proceeding to consider the significance of this text, we wish to state that many exegetes quite rightly attach a Eucharistic

[17] Acts 2: 42, 46 f.
[18] Luke 14: 1.
[19] Is. 58: 7; cf. Jer. 16: 7.
[20] See Schermann, "Das 'Brotbrechen' im Urchristentum" in *Biblische Zeitschrift,* VIII (1910), 42.
[21] I Cor. 10: 17.

meaning to this whole passage. Here St. Paul's argument and conclusions are a special application of the general principle that a meal in common is to be regarded as evidence that those who participate in it are one family, members of one community. Hence the common meal is an expression of unity, of membership in a community to the exclusion of membership in any other religious community. We must now invite the reader's attention to the table of New Testament texts in the original Greek, which he will find in the appendix.[22] In these parallel texts the recurrence of the phrase "breaking of bread" shows that it is an action habitual at every meal and that it is accepted as a symbolic phrase standing for membership in the community.

The verb "to give thanks" and its various derivatives, found in these passages, occur frequently in the Old Testament, in the Talmud, and in present-day Jewish liturgical usage. Everyone familiar with the psalms must have been impressed by the frequency with which such expressions as "Blessed be the Lord," "Let us bless the Lord," "All ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord," are met with over and over again. From these phrases in the psalms is derived the Jewish term *Berakha* ("blessing"). Jewish custom still requires forms of blessings at meals. From the home this usage has passed into the synagogue, where, on the Sabbath, the following prayer (Kiddush) is said over a small silver cup of wine: "Blessed be Thou, eternal God, our God, King of the world, Thou who bringest bread forth from the earth."

[22] See *infra*, p. 404.

Guided by these considerations, we are now able better to understand the passage from the Acts quoted above, where we are told that the Christians "persevered in the breaking of bread and in praising God." "Praising God" is equivalent to "giving thanks" or "blessing." The phrase is associated with the partaking of a meal in common as symbolic of a corporate unity expressive of an interior oneness of spirit and consequently of an external community of possessions. Hence, in the accounts of the institution of the Eucharist we must especially note that such expressions as "breaking bread" and "giving thanks" do not necessarily refer to the institution of the sacrament. Rather that institution rests on our Lord's own words, "This is My body," "This is My blood." [23]

We now turn to the account of the incident in the life of St. Paul before the shipwreck at Malta. The text reads: "Having spoken thus, he took bread and gave thanks to God before them all, and brake it and began to eat. So all were cheered, and themselves partook of food." [24] After a dangerous night, while new perils were threatening, Paul exhorted all on board to take food. The phrase "breaking bread" is evidently equivalent to "taking food." Hence the phrase "the breaking of bread" is equivalent to "eating a meal." The point which the account emphasizes is the good example given by Paul and the fact that, even under such circumstances, he does not forget his table prayer. Seemingly he was the only one to say the prayer, although

[23] See Lagrange on Luke 22: 19.
[24] Acts 27: 35 f.

all took part in the meal with him. Even if we hold that St. Paul said this prayer in some special ritual form (as we may perhaps infer from the fact that the prayer is mentioned), the emphasis lies on the giving of thanks rather than on the breaking of bread. In any event, we have the two expressions "breaking bread" and "giving thanks" without reference to the sacramental meal.

In the account of St. Paul's departure from Troas, we read: "On the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread." [25] In this passage the phrase "to break bread" is best interpreted as meaning to assemble for a meal in common. The reason why St. Paul preached during these night hours and prolonged his discourse until midnight was because he was to depart on the following morning. After the interruption caused by the fall and the restoration of the youth, the text adds: "Then he went up and brake bread and partook, and having talked a considerable time with them, even until daybreak, he took his departure." The point of emphasis in the whole account is the episode of the boy who was raised to life by Paul. Next in emphasis is the discourse of Paul. The reference to the breaking of bread is incidental.

We return to the phrase "the breaking of bread" as found in Acts 2: 42, 46. Those scholars are mistaken who maintain that the expression "breaking of bread" refers explicitly and exclusively to a Eucharistic meal. Still more mistaken is Berning [26] when he asserts, "unless we admit that the phrase 'breaking of bread' sig-

[25] Acts 20: 7.
[26] *Die Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistie*, 1901, p. 161.

nifies the celebration of the Eucharist, we can assign no reasonable meaning to the passage." A little knowledge of the Greek fathers would have kept him from such an opinion. "None of the Greek exegetes interprets the phrase 'breaking of bread' in a Eucharistic sense. Rather they understand the phrase as signifying the partaking of food in common. The Latin fathers in general agree with them." [27]

We must now consider one more text, from the account of the incident at Emmaus. "It came to pass, while He sat at table, that He took the bread and blessed and broke it, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew Him; and He vanished out of their sight." [28] The sense of the passage is that the two disciples recognized Jesus in the way He said the usual Jewish prayer before meals. Evidently Jesus had a special manner of saying this prayer, a manner that remained impressed on the minds of His disciples. "Whether this special trait was a matter of pronunciation or of gesture, evidently it was characteristic." [29]

Before we summarize what we have been saying, one last point remains to be noted. Actual breaking of bread was, among the Jews, universally an act associated with every meal. But the Jews did not call their meal a "breaking of bread." The first to use this phrase as a designation of the common meal was the early Christian community.

Summarizing, we may say that characteristic of early

[27] Schermann, *op. cit.*, p. 163.
[28] Luke 24: 30 f.
[29] Schermann, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

Christianity were the practice of a common meal as an expression of their belonging to Christ and likewise the practice of calling this meal "the breaking of bread." This practice finds its explanation in Christ's personal manner of taking meals with His disciples. Hence "breaking of bread" is the social and religious bond uniting the disciples of Jesus. It is the deepest symbol of their joyful oneness of heart and soul with Jesus and with one another. The full and deep significance of this phrase, as understood by the early Christians, is well expressed in St. Paul's words: "The bread which we break, is it not fellowship in the body of Christ? We many are one bread, one body, for we all partake of the one bread." [30]

[30] Wilpert, in his writings on the catacombs, interprets the *fractio panis* frescoes as referring in every instance to the Eucharist. In our opinion this eminent archeologist is mistaken. Batiffol maintains that Wilpert's interpretation is not valid. Cf. *Revue biblique,* VII (1898), 304–8.

CHAPTER XIX

THE SACRED BANQUET: THE LORD'S SUPPER

ST. PAUL, writing to the Corinthians, tells them that the common meal as they celebrate it does not deserve to be called the Lord's Supper.

> I hear that when ye come together for church there are divisions among you. . . . When ye meet together it is not now to eat the Lord's Supper. For everyone taketh before his own supper to eat. And one indeed is hungry, and another is drunk. Have ye not homes in which to eat and drink? Or do ye despise the church of God, and put to shame the needy? . . . Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another. If any man be hungry, let him eat at home.[1]

The meal here mentioned is a meal in common. It was a joyful meal, so joyful that on occasion some of those present became drunk. Yet, as a matter of fact, it was not a meal in which all participated. It was marked by divisions. Hence St. Paul says it cannot properly be called the Lord's Supper. Many of those present sat down and ate while others went without anything. St. Paul's words express his displeasure. He asks them

[1] I Cor. 11: 18 ff.

why they come into the common assemblies if they do not wish to make the meal one in common. Do they wish perhaps to put to shame those who cannot contribute to the common meal by bringing anything? The Apostle is thinking of the poor of the community, of the large number of slaves. These slaves must first wait on their masters at home and then, without being able to contribute anything of their own, hurry away to the common meal of the Christians. Now here they find they are not admitted to the common table, but are placed at separate tables in groups. They find that not enough food remains to satisfy their hunger.

Against this abuse St. Paul inveighs in his usual vigorous manner. He says only as much as is necessary to abolish the abuse. To show why he refuses to call their meal the Lord's Supper, he explains the condition under which the Christian community meal may rightly be called the Lord's Supper. That condition is that all are treated alike at table. He says: 'We many are one bread, one body, for we all partake of the one bread." [2] Therefore he exhorts the Corinthians to have regard for one another when they come together to eat in order that their meal shall really be a Lord's Supper. To show how significant this condition is, he reminds them that the most important mark of the common meal is that it is a memorial of the Lord. To remember the Lord and to be aware that this meal is a memorial of Him, is the distinguishing trait. Were the meal meant merely to satisfy bodily needs, it might be held by each one at home.

[2] I Cor. 10: 17.

To show them that the common meal is a Lord's Supper, he reminds them of what he has already taught them: "For I have received from the Lord, as I have also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, on the night when He was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks brake and said, 'This is My body on your behalf; this do ye in remembrance of Me.' In like manner after eating, He took the cup saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in My blood; this do ye as often as ye drink thereof in remembrance of Me.'" [3] Resting on these words, Paul concludes: "As often as you eat of this bread and drink of the chalice you announce the death of the Lord until He come."

Here, for the first time in ancient Christian literature, the common meal of Christians is said to be the announcement of the death of the Lord. Consequently the text is of great importance. St. Paul's view emphasizes the common character of the meal as being something more than mere eating in the same place, and therefore admonishes the Corinthians of their duty of earnest self-examination in order to take a worthy part at this common meal. On what does St. Paul base his view? He himself tells us when he says: "For I have received from the Lord, as I have also delivered to you." [4]

The phrase "I have received from the Lord" implies in the most obvious sense, a personal revelation made to the Apostle. Those scholars are mistaken who hold the opinion that the phrase refers, not to a revelation

[3] I Cor. 11: 23 ff.
[4] I Cor. 11: 23.

received directly by St. Paul, but to a tradition originating from our Lord's teaching to the Twelve. From other passages in St. Paul's writings we know his practice of emphasizing the fact that he received his apostleship directly from Christ. Thus, for example, 'I make known to you, brethren, that the gospel preached by me is no gospel of man, nor did I receive or learn it from man, but by revelation from Jesus Christ. . . . Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas." [5]

In our text from I Corinthians, we rightly see a similar insistence upon his apostolic authority as based on a personal revelation. St. Paul wishes to show that the Lord's Supper is a memorial of the death of Jesus. To establish this view, he appeals to the revelation which he had already imparted to the Corinthians. Hence the doctrine that the Lord's Supper is a memorial of Christ's death is a truth which the Corinthians already know. Consequently they were able to appreciate St. Paul's rebuke, namely, that their behavior at the community meal does not accord with the ideal conduct that is proper at such a memorial.

The Synoptic Gospels and St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians substantially agree in their accounts of the Last Supper. But in these accounts we find certain divergences. Textual criticism raises the question whether Luke 22: 19b and 20 was originally in St. Luke's text or whether it was interpolated from St. Paul's account in I Corinthians. For our purpose we need not enter into this controversy. Our argument

[5] Gal. 1: 11 f. Cf. I Thess. 2: 13; 4: 1 f.

rests chiefly on the actions performed by our Lord; as regards these actions we find agreement between the various accounts.

The first point on which all the accounts agree is that Jesus, while blessing and breaking the bread and offering it to the disciples, uttered a phrase which is reported identically in all four accounts: "This is My body." Taking the chalice, He uttered words that were equivalent to "This is My blood." This thought, however, is not formulated identically in the four accounts.

Certain details, which the Gospels do not contain, are found in St. Paul's account. Of these the two most important form part of the words spoken by our Lord at the institution of the Eucharist. In the Apostle's account, Christ says: "This is My body, on your behalf; this do ye in remembrance of Me. . . . This cup is the new covenant in My blood; this do ye as often as ye drink thereof, in remembrance of Me." [6] The words "on your behalf" and "this do ye in remembrance of Me," not found in the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark, are, it is true, found in the present Vulgate text of St. Luke.[7]

The phrase "on your behalf" evidently needs some participle to clarify its meaning and to provide a grammatical connection with the rest of the sentence. The Vulgate (and consequently the Douay English Version) has such a participle ("delivered"), which, however, is not found in the original Greek text.[8]

[6] I Cor. 11: 24 f.
[7] Luke 22: 19.
[8] See Schermann, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

The phrase in the original Greek, here translated "on your behalf," whatever participle we supply, implies the death of the Lord. The proof of this contention is evident from St. Paul's explanation of Christ's words, "Do this in remembrance of Me." After quoting these words of our Lord, he adds words which unmistakably show the meaning of the meal: "As often as you eat this bread and drink the chalice, you announce the death of the Lord until He come."

This announcement of the death of the Lord consists mainly not in words, but rather in all the acts which characterized this meal in common. For example, sitting down at table, breaking the bread, giving thanks, distributing the bread and wine, and partaking of them.[9] All these actions taken together are, in St. Paul's mind, an announcement of the death of the Lord. Hence St. Paul condemns the abuses that had crept into the Corinthians' celebration of the supper. They are no longer acting in a manner worthy [10] of participation in such a sublime act. As St. Paul adds, therefore they were afflicted with sickness and death.

St. Paul's views may be summarized thus: (1) to eat in common makes the supper the Lord's Supper; (2) each partaker must be aware that this meal in common is a memorial of the death of Jesus; (3) hence the gifts are to be received in a worthy manner; (4) thus all will have, at the very beginning of the meal, the proper attitude toward the Lord's Supper.

St. Paul makes this important addition: "The rest I

9 Casel, in *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* VI (1926), 113–204.
10 Cf. Matt. 3: 8; Acts 26: 20; Rom. 8: 18; 16: 2; I Thess. 2: 12.

shall set in order when I come." [11] Evidently St. Paul, in this epistle, has not given his complete instructions in the matter.

That the common meal is a memorial of the Lord, is a truth which St. Paul had already preached to the Corinthians but with which their present conduct did not accord. And since the Apostle bases his doctrine on a personal revelation rather than on the general Christian tradition, the question arises whether the Synoptic Gospels by themselves furnish evidence that the early Christians regarded their celebration of the Lord's Supper as a memorial of His death. Our opinion is that they do.

Let us note the following passage from St. Matthew's Gospel: "Whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed and brake and gave to the disciples, saying, 'Take ye, eat, this is My body.' And He took a cup, and after giving thanks He gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all from it; for this is My blood, the blood of the covenant, which is being shed for many unto the forgiveness of sins. I say to you, henceforth I shall not drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of My Father.' " [12]

We note that the well-known command, "Do this in commemoration of Me," is not to be found in this passage. On the contrary, a superficial view of the passage might consider that this meal was unique, something not to be repeated until the Parousia.

[11] I Cor. 11: 34.
[12] Matt. 26: 26 ff.

But this view is superficial. When, after the death of our Lord, the disciples assembled for their meal in common, they did so in memory of their common meal with Jesus and especially in memory of their last meal with Him. They recalled the words which He spoke on that occasion and rejoiced in the thought of His coming again. Their common meal was both retrospective and expectant. Hence they might well call it "the Lord's Supper," the full meaning of the expression including both these views.

As time went on, their common meal became more and more a commemoration of the Lord.[13] They were continually preoccupied with Old Testament promises and types of the Messias, especially with the prophetic significance of the two Old Testament sacrifices, namely, the paschal sacrifice and covenant of blood. Both these they found fulfilled in the Last Supper.

After their first fright, occasioned by the death of Christ, the disciples began to see that His death was necessary for the coming of the kingdom of God; that His death was a reconciliation for all to God. This truth was evident in our Lord's own words: "This is My blood of the covenant, which is being shed on behalf of many." [14] Hence when the disciples came together for their common meal the thought of His death would be united with the remembrance of the Last Supper. Hence also our Lord's words, "This is My body," as recorded in St. Matthew and St. Mark, have the same

[13] Cf. Luke 22: 19.
[14] Mark 14: 24; cf. Matt. 26: 28.

meaning as the words recorded by St. Paul, "This is My body on your behalf." [15]

We may now summarize what we have been saying. In memory of Jesus the early Christians called their common meal "the breaking of bread." The words of Jesus, "This is My body," imply a reference to His death. "The Lord's Supper" is a meal, not only in memory of the Lord, but especially in memory of His death. Even if in the Synoptic Gospels we could find no direct and undoubted expression of the relation between our Lord's death and the memorial meal, we would still have to hold that the common meal held by Christians was a meal held in memory of His death. St. Paul [16] expresses a view universal among early Christians, namely, that the sacred meal in common, "the Lord's Supper," is a meal in memory of the death of Jesus, a death which reconciled men with God.

[15] I Cor. 11: 24.
[16] I Cor. chap. 11.

CHAPTER XX

THE SACRED BANQUET: THE TABLE OF THE LORD AND THE CUP OF THE LORD

WHAT St. Paul, in I Cor. 11: 20, calls the Lord's Supper, elsewhere in the same Epistle he calls the table of the Lord.[1] This latter phrase introduces us to a new aspect of the early Christians' conception of the sacred meal. The common meal is not merely a meal in memory of the Lord and especially in memory of His death. It is also prepared by the Lord, and Christians become the guests of the Lord when they sit down at His table.

The entire passage reads as follows:

> Therefore, my beloved, flee from idolatry. I speak as to men of understanding. Judge for yourselves what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not fellowship in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not fellowship in the body of Christ? We many are one bread, one body, for we all partake of the one bread. Consider Israel according to the flesh: have not they who eat the sacrifices fellowship with the altar? What then do I mean: That the idol-offering is anything? Or that the idol is anything? No; but that what the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacri-

[1] I Cor. 10: 21.

fice to devils and not to God; and I would not have you enter the fellowship of devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. Or are we to provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than He? [2]

We may summarize this reasoning as follows. To eat of the idol-offering is to eat at the table of demons; to have fellowship at the table of demons is to have fellowship with the demons themselves. To eat of the Lord's Supper is to have fellowship with the table of the Lord, is to have fellowship with the Lord himself. But fellowship with demons excludes fellowship with the Lord. Hence you who have fellowship with the Lord's Supper are not allowed to eat of the idol-offering.

The expression "idol-offering" calls for some explanation. The phrase was employed by the Jews, by the pagans, and by the Christians. Let us proceed to a consideration of this usage among the Jews. The Greek term which we translate "idol-offering" is found in the apocryphal Fourth Book of Machabees (5: 32). It means the flesh of the sacrificial animals which were offered in the pagan temples to the gods. Part of this flesh was consumed in the sacrificial banquet, part of it put on sale in the market place, often close to the temple. But the idea of idol-offering was very ancient among the Jews; in fact, it may be found as early as Deuteronomy (32: 17), where we read: "They sacrificed to devils and not to God." [3] We find, it is true, among the prophets expressions which condemn the pagan gods as being a nothing. Yet in pagan idolatry, the worshiper had in

[2] I Cor. 10: 14 ff.
[3] Cf. Ps. 95: 5; Henoch (apocryphal) 19: 1; 99: 7.

mind to worship an existing being. This idea lies at the base of St. Paul's condemnation of participation in the pagan sacrificial meal. He says: "Are not they that eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?" [4] If this is true of Israel according to the flesh, how much truer it is of Christians, who are Israelites according to the Spirit.

The word "altar" stands for "God." In the contrasted expressions, "fellowship with demons" and "fellowship with the altar," evidently the word "altar" is equivalent to "God." In contrast with "demons" we would expect to find the word "God." Hence we may conclude that the phrase "fellowship with the altar" was a sacred liturgical formula.[5] St. Paul in his subsequent context uses the term "partakers of the table of the Lord" as equivalent to "partakers of the altar." To grasp St. Paul's thought we must now consider the meanings of the word "table," in liturgical connections, as found in the Septuagint, in the Apocalypse, and in the Jewish liturgy.

In the Septuagint, "table" means "altar" in general.[6] It refers also to the table for the loaves of proposition.[7] The Apocalypse, though not using the word "table," speaks equivalently of "the marriage supper of the Lamb" and "the great supper of God." [8] The idea underlying these two passages of the Apocalypse may be illustrated by the Jewish evening liturgy. When the stars appeared, the priests gathered in the Temple and prepared a sacred meal from their portions of the sacri-

[4] I Cor. 10: 18.
[5] Lietzmann, *An die Korinther,* 1923, p. 49.
[6] Ezech. 39: 20; 44: 16; Mal. 1: 7, 12.
[7] Ezech. 41: 22.
[8] Apoc. 19: 9, 17.

ficial flesh and other sacrificial gifts. Jahve was their host, and they sat down at His table. The meal was introduced with a cup of wine. With religious songs "the day of the Lord" was celebrated as the spouse of God.

This evening meal of the priests recalled the prophetic conception of a time when all peoples would be guests of Jahve, eat at His table, and drink from His cup, and thus in truth have fellowship in the table of the Lord. Thus all men are invited to "participate in the altar." Christianity introduced a new and distinctive truth, namely, that those who sit at this table, eat the very flesh and blood of the one who is host at the banquet table. This idea cannot be found in Jewish thought.

In pagan literature we find evidence of the relation between fellowship at the sacred meal and fellowship with the divinity. The chief instances of this idea are found in the papyrus documents. As illustration we quote the following: "Chaeremon invites you to a meal at the table of the Lord Serapis in the Serapeum tomorrow the fifteenth day at the ninth hour." [9] Josephus records a similar invitation to a meal of Anubis in the temple of Isis.[10] Such sacred meals are found in the most various pagan religions. They always signify in some manner the union of the worshiper with the divinity in question, but also the fellowship of the worshipers among themselves. The expenses for such meals in the sacred precincts were borne either by all the members in common or, on particular occasions, by individuals.

Such occasions, as we learn from the *Lex Dianae et*

[9] See Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 50.
[10] *Antiq.*, XVIII, iii, 4.

Antonii, were not infrequent. These meals were in honor of a patronal deity on the anniversary of the dedication of his temple; or on the anniversary of the death of a person who had left a bequest to defray the expenses of the sacred meal. In Latin documents and also in Greek, these personal anniversary meals are spoken of as commemorations. Hence the Gentile Christians, when they spoke of their own commemorative meal, used the familiar terminology of their pagan environment, and called the Lord's Supper a commemoration of the Lord.

We must note also that among the pagans all meals had something of a religious character. The guest who entered was placed under the protection of the domestic god and by that act entered into fellowship with the host. These pagan practices were known to the Corinthian Christians and consequently they were well able to understand the contrast between fellowship with Christ and fellowship with demons. Their fellowship with Christ was implied by participation in the table of Christ, as fellowship with demons was implied by participation in the table of demons. St. Paul's teaching is independent of these pagan parallels. But since the Corinthian Christians were mostly converts from paganism, a knowledge of these pagan practices will enable us to understand better the words which St. Paul chose to express Christian truths to these converts.

Even on purely historical grounds we have to affirm this independence of Christian teaching. First of all, this field has been insufficiently investigated. Furthermore, some of the foremost scholars in this field of re-

search strongly affirm the independence and original character of Christian doctrine. Jülicher, for example, says: "Many scholars in this field speak of pagan practices as the basis of St. Paul's teaching, whereas they should say that these practices were antecedent in point of time." Again he says: "We must never forget that Paul spoke and wrote in the spirit." [11] Another scholar (Reitzenstein), who generally is cited as unduly in favor of Pauline dependence on Hellenistic parallels, expresses himself as follows: "We are simply playing with possibilities when we affirm that a chance find in this field is sufficient to interpret for us the meaning of the Christian mysteries. We may find in this literature parallels with Christian baptism, but not with the Lord's Supper. We may use the images and particularly characteristic words of the Hellenistic mysteries to understand St. Paul's language about Christian mysteries, but not to understand his teaching about these mysteries themselves." [12]

One more Pauline text remains to be considered: "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." [13] This passage is introduced by the words "the cup of blessing which we bless" (verse 16). St. Paul proceeds to interpret this phrase "cup of blessing" as he interpreted the phrase "the bread which we break." The former phrase designates the cup of wine which was drunk at the close of the Jewish meal after the table prayer. Established custom prescribed that the vessel

11 In *Kultur der Gegenwart*, I, IV, 1, 1922, p. 131 c.
12 *Die hellenischischen Mysterienreligionen*, 1920, pp. 56 f.
13 I Cor. 10: 21.

used on this occasion must be one that has not been damaged and must be clean both inside and outside. The one who blessed the cup of wine lifted it a handbreadth above the table, keeping his eyes fixed upon the cup. We do not know whether the blessing was pronounced over the cup or whether the person giving the blessing merely faced toward the cup. At any rate, the Pauline phrase "which we bless," in contrast with "which we break" (referring to the bread), adds emphasis to St. Paul's statement that partaking of this cup is fellowship in the blood of Christ.

Wine is a standing symbol of blood. Thus in the Old Testament wine is called the blood of the grape. For example, Jacob, when blessing Juda, said: "He shall wash his robe in wine, and his garments in the blood of the grape." [14] In pagan literary usage, as summarized by Karl Kircher, "wine makes blood, and blood makes life or is life." [15]

At the Jewish paschal meal, the cup was filled with wine and was passed to all at table five different times. On which of these five occasions did Christ pronounce the words of blessing? Scripture scholars are not unanimous in answering this question.[16] Whether or not this blessing was pronounced over the same cup of wine over which Christ said, "This is the chalice of My blood," we are not here deciding. In any event, since wine is a symbol of blood and since blood is a symbol of life or

[14] Gen. 49: 11. Cf. Deut. 32: 14; Is. 63: 3, 6; Ecclus. 39: 31; 50: 16; I Mach. 6: 34.

[15] *Die sakrale Bedeutung des Weines im Altertum,* 1910, p. 45.

[16] The first cup, the third, the fourth, the fifth: for each of these opinions Zapletal finds possibilities. *Der Wein in der Bibel,* 1920, p. 75.

of the soul, partaking of the cup signifies the most intimate union with Christ and fellowship among those who eat at His table and drink His chalice.

The Lord's Supper is not merely the common meal of Christians and not merely a meal in memory of the Lord and of his death, but also a meal which unites the participants most intimately with Him. Hence the following words of G. Yetter are not sufficient. He says: "The Lord's Supper is a sermon on the cross, and announcement of the death of Christ, an instruction which tells Christians that they are members of that new world created by His death." [17] The Lord's Supper is more than this. Participation in the table of the Lord and in the cup of the Lord is a real fellowship with the body and blood of Christ.

[17] *In Zeitschrift für neut. Wissenschaft,* 1913, p. 215.

CHAPTER XXI

THE SACRED BANQUET: FELLOWSHIP IN THE LORD'S BODY AND BLOOD

WHEN we turn to study the Old Testament in order to throw light on the phrase "fellowship with the altar," we may best begin with studying the notion of the covenant. The common meal is first of all a sign of friendship between men and men. Thus the Gabaonites, though they came under false pretenses, still entered into friendship with Josue by eating and drinking at his table. Again, the covenant on Mount Sinai between the people and God was sealed by a meal which followed. Moses gave command to bring sacrificial animals and to offer them to Jahve. And Jahve Himself was regarded as the heavenly giver of the banquet. By participating in this banquet the Israelites entered into fellowship with God. The pact which they thus made they called the covenant between God and His people. In this pact decisive importance is attached to the blood of the slaughtered animals. Part of this blood Moses sprinkled on the altar, which represents Jahve. With the remainder he sprinkled the people, saying: "This is

the blood of the covenant which Jahve has made with you." [1]

This idea of blood as signifying fellowship in the covenant was never lost in Jewish literature. The priest who carried the blood of the sacrifice animal to the altar expressed thereby the wish that those offering the victims should be made one with Jahve. By this sacrificial blood Jahve was bound, as though by a pact, to be their friend and to accept them in fellowship. Thus the sacrificial blood became likewise the blood of atonement. This blood represented the life of those who sacrificed the animal as a symbolic substitute for themselves.[2]

In the New Testament the word "blood" is used to signify life given in sacrifice. The faith which Christians had in Jesus as Savior, their belief in the vicarious character of His suffering, is expressed by the phrase "the blood of Jesus." Thus, in the Epistle to the Romans [3] we read: "By His grace they are justified freely, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in His blood." [4] In other passages which speak of Christ's vicarious sacrifice, we find, instead of the word "blood," the word "life" or simply "Himself." St. John says: "In this we have known the charity of God, because He hath laid down His life for us." [5] And St. Paul: "He gave

[1] Ex. 24: 8.

[2] A Médibielle, "Le symbolisme du sacrifice expiatoire en Israël," in *Biblica*, II (1921), 141–69, 273–302.

[3] Rom. 3: 24 f.

[4] Cf. Rom. 5: 9; II Cor. 5: 21; Eph. 1: 7; 2: 13.

[5] I John 3: 16.

Himself for our sins." [6] All these passages serve to explain the phrase "on your behalf" in St. Paul's account of the Last Supper, where he tells us that the Lord said: "This is My body on your behalf." [7] They serve also to clarify the passages where mention is made of the cup.

We have four accounts of the Last Supper. Each of these accounts reports the words which our Lord spoke over the cup.[8] Although these four passages are not verbally identical, their essential agreement shows how the disciples of Jesus understood His action and the words that accompanied it. All the passages express the sense of Christ's words, "This is My blood," which is the form of words as quoted by Justin Martyr. Thus those who drink of this cup enter into a union of blood with Him. Thus the Lord's Supper is not merely their commemoration of Jesus, it is a meal commemorating His death as a vicarious sacrifice for the sins of the world.

In all these four texts we have explicit mention of "covenant" in connection with the word "blood." In three of the passages we read "which is being shed for many unto the forgiveness of sins," "which is being shed on behalf of many," and "which is being shed on your behalf." In the fourth passage [9] we read: "This cup is the new covenant in My blood." We have shown above that this phrase "in My blood" is equivalent to "in My blood shed for you." Hence the blood of Christ is both

[6] Gal. 1: 4; cf. Rom. 8: 3; Eph. 5: 2; John 17: 19; I John 1: 7; 2: 2; I Pet. 2: 24 f.; 3: 18.

[7] I Cor. 11: 24; cf. Luke 22: 19.

[8] See the parallel texts in the Appendix.

[9] I Cor. 11: 25.

the blood of atonement and the blood of the covenant. In New Testament thought the covenant is regarded as a consequence of the atonement, whereas in Jewish thought the idea of the propitiatory value of sacrifice is considered a consequence of the covenant on Sinai. "Christ proclaims the covenant in His blood, meaning thereby that the covenant is the consequence of the pouring out of the blood, and not that the blood is merely a symbol of the covenant." [10]

Hence we may say that the Synoptic formulation explicitly states what is implied in St. Paul's phrase "the new covenant in My blood." [11] All four accounts are at one in establishing the meaning of the blood as atonement and as covenant. We may, however, say that Matthew and Mark emphasize the blood of the covenant, as found in Ex. 24: 8: "This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you." On the other hand, Luke and Paul emphasize the fact that this covenant is a new one, which thus fulfils the prophecy of Jeremias: [12] "Behold the day shall come, saith the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Juda; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers." But in all four the blood serves for the establishment of a covenant.

This memorial meal which unites the participants with Him who died on the cross for all mankind, is a sacrificial meal. The blood of Jesus, like that shed in the sacrifice at Mount Sinai, is sacrificial blood. The

[10] Batiffol, *Revue Biblique*, XII (1903), 506.
[11] Cf. Rom. 3: 25 ff.; 5: 9 ff.; Gal. 6: 14 f.
[12] Jer. 31: 31.

scriptural passage which most strongly emphasizes the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper is that where St. Paul speaks of the Lord's Supper and of pagan and Jewish sacrificial meals. St. Paul's comparison in this passage should not be urged beyond proper bounds, nor should it be altogether ignored. The passage itself shows that St. Paul presupposes the knowledge of the Lord's Supper as a sacrificial meal. On the basis of this knowledge he exhorts the Corinthians to abstain from pagan sacrificial meals. Further, the idea of the sacrificial character of Christ's death is found in passages which do not treat of the Lord's Supper. Thus, in I Cor. 5: 7, St. Paul says: "Our Passover hath been sacrificed, even Christ." [13]

The sentence just quoted from the First Epistle to the Corinthians needs further consideration. This passage has no direct relation to the Lord's Supper. The context does, indeed, mention the liturgical assembly (verse 4). In the immediately following context St. Paul speaks of the common meal of Christians (verse 10; cf. Gal. 2: 12). St. Paul's words, "Our Passover hath been sacrificed," are an exhortation addressed to Christians to live without the old leaven of their pagan past. Since the death of the true paschal Lamb, their whole life is for Christians a paschal time, during which no leaven of immoral conduct is allowed.

This passage, therefore, has no direct relation to a sacrificial meal. The word "sacrificed" must here be understood of Christ's death on the cross. St. John (19: 36) speaks of Christ's death as the sacrifice of the paschal Lamb. But the passage presupposes that the

[13] Cf. Rom. 5: 8 f.; Eph. 5: 2; Heb. 10: 12.

Corinthian Christians were familiar with the idea that Christ is the paschal Lamb. Christians considered themselves the true Israel and consequently saw in all the liturgical customs of the Old Testament types which had been fulfilled in Christ. We have already seen that, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, certain elements were traditional Jewish customs. The breaking of bread, the prayer of thanksgiving, the blessing of the cup, the praise of God, were details of the Jewish meal, especially of the solemn paschal meal.

Whether Christ's Last Supper was the Passover celebration or was held on the previous day is a moot question among exegetes. If we could be certain that it took place on the Passover day, we would then have a further reason for our contention that it was a sacrificial meal. In any event, the idea of Jesus being the paschal Lamb is amply documented in various passages of the New Testament. By way of example we quote three texts. The words of John the Baptist: "Behold the Lamb of God, behold Him who taketh away the sin of the world." [14] St. Peter,[15] referring to Christ, says: "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth. . . . Who His own self bore our sins in His body upon the tree." The first part of this quotation is taken from a passage in Isaias where he says, speaking of the Messias: "He shall be led as a sheep to the slaughter, and shall be dumb as a lamb before his shearer." [16] Again St. Peter says: "You were redeemed . . . with the precious blood

[14] John 1: 29.
[15] I Pet. 2: 22, 24.
[16] Is. 53: 7.

of Christ as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled." [17] Every reader will readily recall some of the many passages in the Apocalypse which speak of the blood of the Lamb, the canticle of the Lamb. We have already referred to some of these passages as reflecting early Christian liturgy.

Let us further note that in all probability the first Christians observed the Jewish paschal feast as they did all other Jewish feasts.[18] Hence whether or not Christ's Last Supper was the paschal meal of the Jews, we are sure [19] that the first Christians found in the paschal lamb a symbol of Jesus. Again, the Synoptic accounts of the Last Supper intimate the paschal character of the meal.[20]

On the other hand, we must consider as improbable the view that the Last Supper was the Jewish paschal meal.[21] George Beer, who had made an exhaustive study of the Jewish paschal sacrifice as it is described in the Pesachim tract of the Mishna,[22] reaches the conclusion that Christ's Last Supper was not the Jewish paschal meal.

Nevertheless, if we study the Synoptic accounts and the passage in I Cor. (10: 16), we cannot deny that they have a paschal tone and coloring. This quality of the accounts appears first of all in the choice of place. According to the Synoptics the paschal feast was the occa-

17 I Pet. 1: 18 f.
18 Acts 21: 20.
19 Cf. I Cor. 5: 7.
20 Matt. 26: 17 ff.; Mark 14: 12 ff.; Luke 22: 7 ff.
21 Cf. John 13: 1; 18: 28; 19: 31.
22 Published by Beer in 1912. See page 95.

sion for celebrating the Last Supper in Jerusalem.[23] Furthermore, the Greek word which we translate "cup" [24] is the word used in accounts of the Jewish paschal meal. Thirdly, the word "commemoration," used by St. Luke and St. Paul, is the word used in the Jewish accounts in connection with the address by the head of the family to those assembled for the Passover meal.[25]

Feine thinks that the bread and the wine, apart from all else, contain a relation to the Jewish paschal meal.[26] Dalman holds that the words by which Jesus accompanied the action are not intelligible without reference to the saving power of the lamb slaughtered for the pasch.[27] Whatever value we may attach to these two views, we must maintain that the evidence set forth in the preceding paragraph, although not proving that our Lord ate the Last Supper on the feast of the Passover, does prove that the Last Supper was a paschal meal.

Beer is surprised "that during the so-called paschal meal Jesus did indeed bless bread and wine and attached to them a meaning referring to Himself, but did not express any relation between Himself and the paschal meal, although the oldest tradition regarded the paschal lamb as a type of the sacrificial death of Jesus." [28] But may we not with more reason argue that what Jesus Himself did was the source of that oldest tradition? The

[23] See Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*, 1921, p. 253.
[24] I Cor. 10: 16.
[25] This view is maintained by Lagrange, on Luke 22: 19.
[26] *Die Religion des NT*, 1921, p. 95.
[27] *Op. cit.*, p. 254.
[28] *Op. cit.*, p. 100.

oldest expression of tradition,[29] taken together with the Synoptic accounts and their insistence upon all that Jesus did on that memorable evening, must lead even the most exigent of scholars to admit that Christians considered the Last Supper as a paschal meal and consequently as a sacrificial meal.

Let us summarize the preceding pages. Those who partook of the pagan sacrifices entered into communion with the demons. The Jews, eating of their sacrifices, entered into communion with the altar (God). Hence Christians, drinking the cup of the Lord and sharing in the table of the Lord, enter into communion with the body and blood of Christ.

We know that the Jews daily offered a lamb as sacrifice in the Temple. But from this practice alone we cannot prove the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper unless we have established on other grounds that Jesus is the sacrificial Lamb. Consequently this proof rests on the considerations we have just been giving.

Neither can we derive the proof from I Cor. 10: 4, where St. Paul is speaking of the Israelites in the desert. "All ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink; for they drank from the spiritual rock . . . and Christ was the rock." From this passage Bugge concludes that "the drinking of the wine in the Lord's Supper is in truth sharing in the power and life of Christ." [30] Against the validity of this conclusion we must urge that in this passage St. Paul does not in any way refer to the sacred meal of Christians. "The manna

[29] I Cor. 5: 7.
[30] *Das Christus Mysterium,* 1915, p. 106.

and the water from the rock are not regarded by the Apostle as a kind of Jewish Eucharist, and not even as a prophetic figure of the Christian Eucharist. In this passage the word 'spiritual' does not have the sense of nourishment for those who are spiritual nor of nourishment in a figurative or prophetic sense. The word, in St. Paul's usage, never has this latter meaning. The epithet 'spiritual' applied to food and drink means simply their miraculous origin, the supernatural character of the manna and of the water from the rock." [31]

The sacrificial nature of the Last Supper cannot be established from Jewish sources alone. Nor can it be proved by the New Testament passages which we have been quoting, unless we add to them St. Paul's explicit comparison [32] of the Christian sacrificial meal to the Jewish and pagan sacrificial meals. But further, this passage in I Corinthians is not by itself a direct testimony for the Eucharistic character of the Lord's Supper. "Since the point of comparison is the communion with the divinity, we may not from this passage conclude directly the sacrificial character of the body and blood of Christ. . . . But indirectly we may conclude the sacrificial character of the Eucharist." [33]

Further, we may ask why St. Paul in this passage makes any reference to the Jewish liturgy. Why does he not rather refer to the Christian liturgy? The only answer is that he is not here referring to the sacrificial character of the Christian meal, but only to the com-

[31] Mangenot, in *Revue du Clergé français,* LXXV (1913), 149.
[32] I Cor. 10: 16 ff.
[33] Brinktrine, *Der Messopferbegriff,* 1918, p. 36.

munion with Christ which it produces. For this purpose he refers to the two sacrificial conceptions, pagan and Jewish. Hence also, distinguishing food from drink, he concludes to the double communion, one with the body of Christ ("the bread which we break"), the other with the blood of Christ ("the cup which we bless").

May we say that the analogy with pagan conceptions of sacrifice influenced St. Paul's terminology in this passage? We may not. True, the pagans did consider that they entered into communion with the divinity by participating in the sacrificial food. But we cannot prove historically that they regarded this communion as an eating of the flesh of the god and the drinking of his blood. Secondly, St. Paul's text itself certainly does not urge the analogy this far. For the purpose of his argument, Jews and pagans are in the same category. For the Jews, the idea of drinking blood is intolerable.[34] Hence this analogy, drawn from the pagan sacrifices, does not show that St. Paul is here directly speaking of the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper.

Whatever view scholars may take regarding the exact meaning of other New Testament passages, we can affirm with certainty that John 6: 52–58 mentions explicitly the real eating of Christ's body and the real drinking of His blood. The text reads as follows:

> The Jews therefore strove with one another, saying: How can this man give us His flesh to eat? Jesus therefore said to them: Amen, amen I say to you, unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have not life in you. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath

[34] Cf. Acts 15: 20, 29.

everlasting life; and I will raise him up on the last day. For My flesh is food indeed, and My blood is drink indeed. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live because of the Father, so he that eateth Me, he also shall live because of Me. . . . This is the bread come down from heaven: not as the fathers ate and died: he that eateth this bread shall live forever.

The words of this passage are an admirable illustration of our contention that in the New Testament writings we find repeatedly expressions of the early Christian liturgy. Let us note that in the entire sixth chapter St. John makes no reference to the blood of Christ before verse 51. In this verse the blood is implicitly referred to by the phrase "the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." In verses 54–56 explicit mention is made of the blood. Hence this passage presupposes readers who are familiar with the Lord's Supper. In post-apostolic writings we find abundant evidence of such a view. We are not surprised, therefore, to find this same view in the writings of St. John. We should recall that we have already seen the same ideas in St. Paul's doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

Jesus often speaks in metaphors. Thus, to restrict ourselves to St. John's Gospel, He calls Himself "the light of the world" and "the vine" (chap. 15). Let us notice the difference between this last passage and our present passage from the sixth chapter. In 15: 4, Jesus says: "Abide in Me, and I in you." In 6: 57, He says: "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him." Although the same phrase occurs

in both passages, we find that in chapter 15 St. John is not explicitly referring to Christ's body and blood. Why, then, does he, in the sixth chapter, after Christ has called Himself the bread of life, come to speak of the sacred meal and to speak in such unmistakable terms of eating the flesh of the Lord and drinking His blood? The answer is that here the Evangelist's words reflect the language of the liturgy which was familiar to him. "The language of this passage (6: 51–57) becomes much more intelligible if we study it with the early Christian litury in mind. To prove the real presence of our Lord in the liturgy the author at this point introduces the idea of the Lord's Supper. We seem to be listening to the liturgical formulas of the Eucharistic mystery." [35]

[35] Welter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, 1921, p. 146 f.

CHAPTER XXII

LITURGICAL PLACES AND TIMES

PLACES

THE first Christian converts, as we have often said, continued to frequent the Temple and synagogue and to attend the liturgical services. Unhindered by the Jews, they still regarded the Temple and the synagogue as their favorite places of prayer. Here they read the Scriptures and listened to the explanations by interpreters both Jewish and Christian.

The Temple had long been the center of Jewish piety. On ordinary days the people of Jerusalem and of the neighboring districts came to the Temple for the morning and evening sacrifice or to offer private sacrifices or to pay their vows. On the chief feasts of the year, especially the Passover, or on other extraordinary occasions, crowds of pilgrims came from other parts of Palestine and from the Diaspora. As Christian examples, St. James and St. Paul must suffice.[1]

St. Paul was in Jerusalem after his third journey. His

[1] Acts 21: 18 ff.

frequenting the Temple was not on this occasion owing to his own initiative. Zealots of the law expressed a wish that he should go to the Temple and there sanctify himself with four other men and pay the expenses of these men. Evidently the Nazarite vow is here referred to. St. Paul undertook to pay the expenses of the four men who were fulfilling their vow. The sum required had to be sufficient for the purchase of a yearling male lamb for a holocaust, of another as a sacrifice for sin, a ram for thanksgiving, a basket of fine flour, unleavened loaves on which oil had been poured, and the other sacrificial foods and drinks prescribed for the fulfilment of this vow. The text says explicitly that St. Paul acted according to their wish (verse 26).

Elsewhere we find evidence of St. Paul's custom of praying in the Temple. In the course of his address to the people in the Temple immediately after his arrest, he said: "After I had returned to Jerusalem and was praying in the Temple." [2] His reverence for the Temple is clearly expressed in II Thess. 2: 4, where he speaks of the Temple as God's sanctuary.

The custom of the early Christians is shown in many passages of St. Luke's writings. The disciples who were present at the ascension "returned to Jerusalem with great joy; and were continually in the Temple, praising and blessing God." [3] "They continued daily in the Temple"; [4] "Peter and John went up to the Temple to pray"; [5] "They were all with one accord in Solomon's

[2] Acts 22: 17.
[3] Luke 24: 52.
[4] Acts 2: 46.
[5] Acts 3: 1.

Portico." [6] The Apostles, after being released from prison, "entered the Temple about daybreak and began to teach." [7] Again the text, speaking of the Apostles, says: "Every day in the Temple and at home they ceased not to teach and to proclaim Jesus as the Christ." [8]

Two purposes brought the Christians to the Temple: to pray and to receive instruction. Sacrifice as a purpose of Christians in the Temple is mentioned only in two texts: Acts 21: 26 and Matt. 5: 23. The former has already been mentioned above in connection with St. Paul. In the other text our Lord says: "If therefore thou offer thy gift at the altar."

Prayer and doctrine were likewise the two purposes that drew the Christians to the synagogues. We find this custom explicitly recorded for many cities, including Rome and Jerusalem. And in Jerusalem we find mention of different synagogues for the use of separate groups: the Libertines, the Cyrenians, the Alexandrians, and those from Cilicia and the Roman province of Asia. But we find no mention of a special synagogue for Christians. Christians were called by various names: for instance, Galileans,[9] and Nazarenes.[10] But we find no synagogue thus designated. Hence we may conclude that Christians were not looked upon as a distinct group, but as belonging to the Jewish people in general.

One reason why the Christians preferred the synagogal worship rather than the Temple service was that

[6] Acts 5: 12.
[7] Acts 5: 21.
[8] Acts 5: 42.
[9] Mark 14: 70; Acts 2: 7.
[10] Acts 24: 5.

the Old Testament sacrifices were not offered in the synagogues. Hence the synagogal liturgy corresponded better to the Christian idea of spiritual worship.[11] We read in St. Paul, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" [12] We are justified in understanding the sentence as expressing opposition to the external sacrifices of the Temple. Further, our Lord's own words one day as He was leaving the Temple, "There shall not be left here a stone upon a stone," [13] would lead the Christians to be disinclined to participation in the sacrificial worship of the Temple, and to prefer the services in the synagogue.

A second reason for the Christian preference was that the synagogue offered more favorable opportunities for the expounding of the Scriptures. In the synagogue the practice prevailed of extending to persons present the privilege of addressing the assembly. Thus the synagogue was especially suitable as a place for Christian preaching.[14] And it offered frequent occasion for discussion with the Jews.[15]

What first separated the Christians from the synagogues was not prayer but doctrine. Christians believed that Jesus was the Messias and interpreted the Scriptures accordingly.[16] The Jews regarded the Christians as unorthodox. The Christians, in turn, accused the Jews of hardheartedness and began to preach to the

11 Nielen, in *Theologie u. Glaube,* XVIII (1926), 693–701.
12 I Cor. 3: 16.
13 Mark 13: 2.
14 Acts 17: 17; 18: 26.
15 Acts 6: 9; cf. Matt. 10: 17; 23: 34.
16 See John 9: 22.

Gentile proselytes. The difference in doctrine led gradually to a separation in the matter of prayer. At the close of the first century we find the Jews endeavoring to keep the Christians out of the synagogues. As illustration, we have a prayer of Samuel the Younger, who at the instigation of Rabbi Gamaliel II introduced into the Shemone Esre a petition for the annihilation of the Christians.[17]

Our account of the synagogue is confirmed by the evidence in the Acts of the Apostles, where we are repeatedly told that St. Paul and his companions entered the synagogue of one city after another. We need not cite specific instances because the fact is well known. But we may refer to Acts 9: 1 f., where we are told that Saul was given letters of commendation to the synagogues in Damascus, "that if he found any men and women of this way, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem." Evidently at this time the Christians still frequented the synagogue.

But they had also their own places of assembly even before they separated from the synagogue. In Acts 2: 46 we are told that they assembled, not only in the Temple, but in private houses. We have already seen that this passage does not mean that every Christian house was a place of assembly. Private houses, as Christian places of assembly, are often referred to. The first instance is in Acts 1: 13, where we are told that the first disciples of Jesus came back from the ascension and abode in the upper room, where they persevered with one mind in

[17] See Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst*, p. 37.

prayer.[18] We may note that the address which St. Peter delivered on the occasion of the election of Matthias has all the marks of the kind of discourse usual in the synagogue.

What upper room was this? St. Luke's text evidently supposes that his readers are familiar with the expression as having reference to a specific place. This fact may be the reason why the term came to be understood as referring to the scene of the Last Supper.[19] The "upper room" where Tabitha was laid out for burial must have been a rather large room since the widows and other Christians of Joppe were assembled there.[20] Again in Troas the community is assembled in an upper room, Paul being with them for the breaking of bread.[21] The Vulgate generally translates the Greek word *hyperoon* by *coenaculum* ("supper room"). This meaning is clearly that of the word in the passage just cited. And this meaning leads us to the chief reason why the Christians withdrew from Temple and synagogue.

They were not prompted mostly by their need for having a more private place for their meetings. Further we find that they already used to meet in private houses before they felt the necessity of separating from the synagogue. This necessity did not arise until the Christians became, in the eyes of the Jews, a distinct sect.[22] The Christians were prompted by reverence for the

18 Acts 1: 14.
19 Mark 14: 15; Luke 22: 12.
20 Acts 9: 37 ff.
21 Acts 20: 7.
22 Acts 24: 5.

custom which Jesus had exercised, of eating in common with His disciples,[23] by the need for a suitable place for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and by the nature of their union with Christ and with one another. The Lord's Supper was celebrated toward evening in the supper room of some spacious private house. And since the Lord's Supper signified this union, we can understand why Christians began to meet in private houses in addition to their frequenting of the Temple and the synagogue, and then at last to the exclusion of the latter. Thus understood, the celebration of the Lord's Supper was the circumstance that gave rise to the practice by the Christians of having their own meeting places.

The Christian community grew rapidly. The 120 gathered in the supper room [24] became 3,000 on Pentecost,[25] and somewhat later 5,000.[26] Then we are told that many Jewish priests joined the Christian ranks.[27] The persecution in which St. Stephen was martyred extended the community beyond the bounds of Jerusalem [28] and later beyond the bounds of Palestine.[29] As their numbers grew and could not be accommodated in a single house, different groups were formed to hold separate meetings in different houses. One such private house was the house of Mary the mother of John

[23] Cf. Acts 1: 13 f.
[24] Acts 1: 15.
[25] Acts 2: 41.
[26] Acts 4: 4.
[27] Acts 6: 7.
[28] Acts 8: 1.
[29] Acts 11: 19.

Mark.[30] In other cities the home of the first converts became the first Christian meeting place.[31] The practice was perhaps strengthened by the fact that this home was the place where the Christian missioner stayed while in that city. Thus in Corinth the Christian community seems to have assembled in the house of Stephanas, and later on, after separation from the synagogue, in the house of the devout Titus Justus.[32] Aquila and Prisca opened their home in Ephesus [33] and later in Rome [34] to St. Paul. In Romans 16: 23, St. Paul calls Gaius "my host, and the host of the whole Church." In Colossae, Philemon was host to the community.[35] In Laodicea the house of Nympha was the Christian meeting place.[36] In Cenchrae, the house of Phoebe.[37] Possibly the persons mentioned in the salutations of St. Paul's letters were likewise hosts to the Christian community which gathered in their house for the common meal.

How many such domestic meeting places were there in the town where Christian communities were formed? The New Testament gives us no sure indications. Belser [38] attempts to prove that in Jerusalem seven such places were to be found. His argument is the fact that the number of deacons was seven. This argument, as we have noted elsewhere, is not cogent. We do not know

30 Acts 12: 12.
31 I Cor. 16: 15.
32 Acts 18: 7.
33 I Cor. 16: 19.
34 Rom. 16: 3.
35 Philem. 2.
36 Col. 4: 15.
37 Rom. 16: 2.
38 *Apostelgeschichte,* 1905, p. 87.

whether the individual deacons were assigned one to each meeting place or whether each deacon served several meeting places. We may with some reason suppose that the Apostles, in the appointing of seven deacons, were influenced by the Jewish practice of appointing a committee of seven in each of their cities. Baumgartner maintains that the Apostles were moved to imitate this practice by the Rabbinic interpretation of Deut. 16: 18.[39]

"The church in the house of so-and-so" was the usual expression indicating the Christian community assembled for divine service.[40] At first their purpose for assembling was the celebration of the common meal. A second purpose soon became operative, namely, separation from the synagogue.[41] This separation led to the use of private houses for purposes of prayer and the reading of Scripture.[42] In Acts 5: 42 the Temple and the Christian private meeting places are mentioned together as places where the Apostles taught and proclaimed Jesus as the Christ. The very word *ekklesia* ("church") points to this separation from the synagogue. The Christians did not choose, as a term to designate their meeting places, the word "synagogue," as might have been expected. Instead, they chose the solemn liturgical term *ekklesia* ("church").[43]

The word "church" was used by the Jews to express

[39] Ephrem Baumgartner, "Zur Siebenzahl der Diakone in der Urkirche zu Jerusalem," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, VII (1909), 49–53.

[40] Rom. 16: 5, 23; I Cor. 16: 19; Col. 4: 15; Philem. 2.

[41] Acts 14: 4; 18: 6; 19: 9.

[42] I Cor. 14: 28, 35; Col. 4: 16.

[43] I Cor. 11: 18; 14: 23, 34.

the relation of the entire Jewish people to God. Hence the term was well understood among the Greek-speaking Jews. The word, therefore, was well suited to interpret the Christian religion to the Gentiles. The Christian religion was not merely a synagogue, like other synagogues; it was the synagogue of God. The solemn dignity of the expression showed the esteem that Christians had for the term. In New Testament literature the word is reserved exclusively to designate the faithful and their places of assembly. Thus we find it used in the salutations of the epistles to the Galatians, Thessalonians, and Corinthians.[44] The Christian community is the Church of God,[45] of Christ,[46] and of the saints.[47] The term signifies the entire Christian community and also each local assembly of the Christians, who consider themselves one with the whole Christian body.[48]

A number of New Testament expressions connected with the Greek word *oikia* ("house") remain to be considered. Thus we have St. Paul telling Timothy how he ought to conduct himself "in the house of God, which is the church of the living God." [49] We frequently have the expression "members of the household," which does not imply a local restriction, especially when the phrase reads "members of the household of God." The phrase is primarily metaphorical, meaning the Christian community. In I Pet. 2: 5 we have a noun "house" and a

[44] Cf., as contrast, Acts 14: 1; Apoc. 3: 9.
[45] I Cor. 11: 16; I Thess. 2: 14; II Thess. 1: 4.
[46] Rom. 16: 16.
[47] I Cor. 14: 33.
[48] Cf. Acts 5: 11; 8: 1; 12: 1; Gal. 1: 22.
[49] I Tim. 3: 15.

verb "to be built into a house." The Westminster version renders the passage thus: "Be ye built up into a spiritual house." [50] Both among the Jews and among the Christians the expression "the house of God" signifies the Temple.[51] Hence we are justified in concluding that Christians used the phrase "house of God" for the place of their own liturgical assemblies. St. Paul writing to the Ephesians, says: "Ye are no longer strangers and foreigners, but ye are fellow citizens of the saints and members of the household of God." [52] Here the expression "members of the household of God," especially as it stands in opposition to "strangers and foreigners," sounds like a liturgical echo. Historically the word "church" seems to be traceable to the Greek phrase *tou kuriou,* meaning "of the Lord."

TIMES

As the first Christians preserved the Jewish custom in regard to places of prayer, so they observed it in regard to times of prayer.

The Jewish custom of set times for prayer was not a very old custom. At the earliest it arose in the second century B. C. The four books of the Bible which most insist on the value of prayer are Jeremias, Daniel, Tobias, and the Psalms. None of these mentions the obligation of a set time of prayer. True, Daniel speaks of a

[50] Cf. Heb. 3: 6; I Pet. 4: 17.

[51] Mark 2: 26; Luke 6: 4; 11: 51; John 2: 17; Acts 7: 47 ff.; Heb. 10: 21; cf. Matt. 21: 13; Mark 11: 17; Luke 19: 46.

[52] Eph. 2: 19.

prayer to be said three times a day.[53] Esdras speaks of a prayer at the time of the evening sacrifice.[54] But neither refers to the duty of observing these times. Beginning in the second century B. C., little by little appears the duty of praying the Shema morning and evening and of praying the Shemone Esre three times a day, and the custom of saying table prayers. In the Acts of the Apostles we read that St. Peter went up to the roof to pray at the sixth hour.[55] According to Josephus, services were held in the Temple at the sixth hour,[56] and at the ninth hour.[57]

When we read of the early Christians that "day by day they persevered with one accord in the Temple," [58] we may reasonably suppose that they were observing the regular hours of prayer. But from the Acts of the Apostles we know that they assembled for prayer also at other hours. Thus we read that the Spirit of God came upon the disciples when they were in prayer at the third hour.[59] Again we are told that Paul and Silas in prison were praising God at midnight.[60] These two examples will suffice.

The Jews had a seven-day week. The Greeks divided the month into ten-day periods. The Romans had two ways of dividing the month: by eight-day periods and

[53] Dan. 6: 11, 13; 9: 21.
[54] I Esd. 9: 5.
[55] Acts 10: 9; cf. Dan. 6: 11, 14; Ps. 54: 18.
[56] *Bell. jud.*, I, xxxiii, 2.
[57] *Ibid.*, I, iii, 1.
[58] Acts 2: 46.
[59] Acts 2: 15.
[60] Acts 16: 25.

by seven-day periods. The former, called nundinae, had seven days of work followed by a market day. The seven-day period had the individual days named after the planets. Christians retained the Jewish custom until the fourth century. The Jewish custom of numbering the days of the week instead of naming them is still followed in the Roman liturgy.

The converts from Judaism, since they preserved the Jewish week, undoubtedly also observed the celebration of the Sabbath. The Christians in Jerusalem thought that the Law bound Jewish converts even after their conversion.[61] Further, they wished to lay some obligations of the Law also upon the Gentile converts.[62] These liturgical demands they felt to be necessary that the new Christian communities outside Jerusalem should retain their union with the Church in Jerusalem.

Among these obligations we find no mention of the observance of the Sabbath. The Gentile converts were accustomed to follow the Roman or Greek week. Further, the Jewish Christians were beginning to withdraw from the observance of the Jewish liturgy. But some fanatical adherents of the Law attempted even later to bind the Gentile communities to the Sabbath observance. We are thus led to St. Paul's opposition to these extremists.

The principle on which he bases his opposition is clearly expressed in Rom. 14: 1–21. St. Paul says that "one man esteemeth one day better than another,

[61] Acts 21: 20 ff.
[62] Acts 15: 20 ff.

whereas another esteemeth all days alike." He immediately adds the principle in judging such matters. It is that of Christian freedom. Each must live according to his own conviction. "Let each be fully assured in his own mind." Hence St. Paul's view is that to regard certain days as sacred is a matter of indifference, provided no man give his brother occasion of scandal. For "the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but justice and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit."

The opposition is more pointed in Galatians,[63] where the observance of "days and months and seasons and years" is spoken of as a return "to the weak and beggarly elements, whereto ye wish once again to be enslaved." Here, then, the observance of Jewish Sabbaths and feasts is regarded as a mark of Jewish piety, to which Christians are no longer bound.

We must here note several details. First, the high esteem which the Jews had for their feasts; evidently St. Paul presupposes this fact. Secondly, the Christian custom of celebrating these Jewish festivals; this practice makes St. Paul fear for their Christian liberty. Thirdly, the Christians' right to be guided by their own conscience in selecting days to be kept sacred.

Since St. Paul is condemning the observance of Jewish holy days and seasons, why does he not mention Christian festival days? His argument would thus become much more cogent. The answer is that at least at the time of the Epistle to the Galatians the Christians did not yet celebrate special feast days. The same re-

[63] Gal. 4: 8 ff.

mark should be made about a similar passage in Colossians.[64] St. Paul contrasts with the elements of the world Christ in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally. This contrast leads to the conclusion: "Let no one then sit in judgment on you in respect of eating or drinking or in a matter of a feast day or a new moon or a Sabbath: such things are a shadow of things to come, but the substance is of Christ."

Here again St. Paul returns to the inmost kernel of Christianity, the union with Christ the glorified Lord to whom belongs the fulness of divinity. He shows the incompatibility between observance of the Jewish liturgy and the new Christian faith. Although aware of the importance of feast days in Jewish practice, he makes no reference to feast days that are to be observed by Christians. Christians possess Christ and consequently do not need a symbol of Him. Since Jewish symbols are now the "traditions of men, the elements of the world, why, as though still living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances such as 'Handle not, nor taste, nor even touch'—things which are all perishable in their use? This were to follow the precepts and doctrines of men." [65]

St. Paul's contention against the observance of Jewish feast days is probably the reason why we find in the New Testament so few references to the observance of special liturgical days. What we do find is concerned exclusively with the first day of the Jewish week. In Acts 20: 7 and in I Cor. 16: 2, this day is called "the

[64] Col. 2: 8 ff.
[65] Col. 2: 20 ff.

first day of the week." Later on Christians began to call it the "Lord's day," [66] evidently because it was the day of the resurrection.[67] The four Evangelists testify that the resurrection took place on the first day of the week.[68] Other dates, as, for instance, that of our Lord's death, must be determined by reckoning back from the day of the resurrection. With the exception of Christ's disputes with the Pharisees on the Sabbath, nowhere else in the Gospels do we find references to the day of the week on which any event occurred.

Since the resurrection is the foundation of Christian faith and since this faith finds expression in the liturgy, we might expect that the Christians would assemble for worship on the first day of the week and would call it the Lord's day. The historical evidence found in the practice of the early Church shows that in fact they did so. They regarded Sunday as a perpetual celebration of the resurrection. This view has been retained in the liturgy, especially in that of the Eastern Churches.[69]

We should note the difference between "the Lord's day" and "the day of the Lord." The latter expression in the New Testament signifies the Parousia.[70] Whether the idea "the day of the Lord" influenced the Christians in their designation of the first day of the week (the Lord's day),[71] we cannot say.

[66] Also *Didache*, XIV, 1. Justin, *I Apol.*, 67 (Migne, *PL*, VI, 429), calls it "the day of the sun."

[67] Cf. Rüscher, *Sabbat und Sonntag im Lichte des NT*, 1914.

[68] Matt. 28: 1; Mark 16: 2; Luke 24: 1; John 20: 1, 19.

[69] Baumstark, *Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der syrischen Jakobiten*, 1910, p. 266.

[70] I Cor. 1: 8; 5: 5; II Cor. 1: 14; I Thess. 5: 2; II Thess. 2: 2; Phil. 1: 6, 10; 2: 16; II Pet. 3: 10; cf. Acts 2: 20.

[71] Apoc. 1: 10.

But from the New Testament alone we cannot prove that Christians held their liturgical assemblies on the first day of the week. All documentary evidence of such a practice is of later date.[72] In Acts we find that the Christians in Troas did indeed assemble on the first day of the week (20: 7). But we have no means of ascertaining whether the meeting was on account of St. Paul's presence among them or whether they habitually met on that day. Schürer, speaking of this assembly at Troas, says: "This is not an isolated instance. To assemble for the breaking of bread on the first day of the week was customary in Pauline circles. Now, since the breaking of bread was a religious act, we are justified in concluding that the first day of the week was the regular day for liturgical assemblies." [73] Schürer's conclusion cannot be established from the passage in Acts; it can be proved from later evidence.

A more likely evidence for Sunday observance by the early Christians is that furnished by St. Paul in I Cor. 16: 2. The significant words of the passage are as follows: "Upon the first day of every week let each of you put by whatever he may well spare, that the collections may not be set on foot then only when I am come." But even in this text we cannot see clearly that the first day of the week was an assembly day for Christians always and everywhere. Nor can we see that this day was the only day for such assemblies.

Conclusions like the following are more or less conjectural. Jülicher is of the opinion that Christians as-

[72] *Didache*, XIV, 1; Justin, *I Apol.*, *loc. cit.*
[73] *Zeitschrift für neut. Wissenschaft*, VI (1905), 1.

sembled in one place at least once a week, on the Lord's day. He adds these words: "At other times, too, smaller groups of Christians met together every evening for mutual edification." [74] Smend writes as follows: "We find among the early Christians morning assemblies which are accessible to all, at which the oral instruction was the important element, and which secondarily served spreading the Gospel. We find likewise evening assemblies which are for the faithful alone and derive their name, the Lord's Supper, from their chief purpose. But we cannot ascertain whether the meal was at the beginning or at the end." [75]

We may admit that Christians probably did hold morning assemblies as well as evening assemblies. This view is supported by the fact that the Jews began their Sabbath observance on Friday evening and had morning and evening sacrifices in the Temple. But we cannot base this conclusion on New Testament sources alone.

From the New Testament we can establish with certainty that the Christian Sunday observance was much influenced by the Jewish Sabbath observance. For a long time we find two parallel currents. In one, the Christian Sunday observance developed in opposition to Jewish custom. St. Paul was the chief figure in this separation from the synagogue and the Jewish liturgy.[76] His opposition was not merely to Judaism, but to any special

[74] In *Die Kultur der Gegenwart,* Teil I, Abt. IV, I, erste Hälfte, 1922, p. 92. An excellent discussion of the question will be found in Dumaine, "Dimanche" in *Dictionnaire d'archéol. chrèt. et de liturgie,* IV, 861.

[75] *Die römische Messe,* 1920, p. 3.

[76] Cf. Dölger, *Der Heilige Fisch,* 1922, p. 536.

observance of days or seasons.[77] With the passing of time this opposition became less marked. The other current of development sprang from Christian sources, particularly from the commemoration of the resurrection and other important events of the "new creation." Thus for a long time we find the resurrection observance side by side with the Sabbath observance. This twofold observance continued not only among Jewish converts but also among Gentile converts.

How far other Jewish feasts continued to influence early Christianity, we cannot determine from New Testament sources alone. From I Cor. 5: 7 ("Christ our pasch is sacrificed") we may conclude that the Jewish Passover sacrifice had some influence on the Christian feast of Easter. Still we must bear in mind that Easter and Sunday observance were founded on the resurrection.

[77] Rom. 14: 5; Gal. 4: 9 f.; Col. 2: 16.

CHAPTER XXIII

PARTICIPATION OF THE FAITHFUL

THE THREE CLASSES

THE distinction between believers and unbelievers is well marked in the New Testament, especially in St. Paul's expression "those within and those without." [1] But can we find in the New Testament the *disciplina arcani?* We cannot if we take the term in its proper sense.[2] But we do find evidence that the early Christians were aware of a distinct separation between them and others. This feeling implies the use of a separate place for their religious meetings. St. Paul in I Cor. 5: 12 says: "What have I to do with judging those without? Is it not those within whom you are to judge?" "Those within" means those who have a right to participate in the liturgy of the assembled community.

1 I Cor. 5: 12; I Thess. 4: 12; Col. 4: 5; I Tim. 3: 7; cf. Mark 4: 11.

2 Batiffol has shown that the *disciplina arcani* originated much later than is frequently supposed. Cf. his "La discipline de l'arcane" in *Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive,* 1906, pp. 1–41. Funk maintains a contrary view ("Alter der Arkandisziplin" in *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen,* III [1907], 42–57). But the texts which he adduces do not go back beyond the second century. Cf. also J. Lightfoot, *Horae hebraicae et talmudicae in IV Evang.,* 1864 (on Mark 4: 11).

But this distinction between "those within" and "those without" does not mean that non-Christians were forbidden to be present in the meeting place. At first the Christians imitated the Jewish practice of allowing outsiders to attend the services. In the Diaspora at least the Jews seemed to have permitted Gentiles to be present at their services. The Jews' desire to spread their religion and to win numerous proselytes overcame their aversion to contact with Gentiles. Thus we know, for example, that when St. Paul preached in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia, many Gentiles were present.[3]

St. Paul likewise testifies to the presence of unbelievers in Christian assemblies, when he says: [4] "If, then, the whole church be assembled together, and all be speaking in tongues, and *idiotae* or unbelievers enter, will they not say that ye are raving?" [5] Probably this presence of unbelievers was restricted to the instructional portion of the meeting. This view finds confirmation in St. Paul's account of the celebration of the Lord's Supper.[6] This description seems to exclude the presence of non-Christians. St. Paul's condemnation of the rich who, at the Lord's Supper, disregarded the needs of the poor, has a parallel in Jewish tradition, according to which in the celebration of the paschal meal also the poor should be invited to the table.

Some scholars maintain that those whom St. Paul calls *idiotae* [7] were a special class, composed of those

[3] Acts 13: 46 ff.
[4] I Cor. 14: 23.
[5] Cf. verse 24.
[6] I Cor. 10: 16 ff.; 11: 17–34.
[7] The Greek word ἰδιώτης (fem. ἰδιῶτις) signifies an intermediate stage be-

who were preparing for the faith but not yet admitted to the body of the faithful. This view is based on a false conception of the meaning of the word in this passage (I Cor. 14: 23). Here *idiotae* means those who did not have the gift of tongues. We cannot compare them with those who were later on called catechumens, because the gift of tongues cannot be taught and because some [8] Christians did not possess this gift.

But in verse 23 the *idiotes* referred to can hardly be considered a Christian, since a Christian would not be surprised at witnessing the exercise of the gift of tongues, even though he himself did not possess it. Hence this term means here non-Christian. In this passage, neither the "unendowed person" nor the unbeliever belongs to the Church, but both are admitted to the assembly. The primitive Christian meetings provided opportunity for the preaching of Christian doctrine.

We may interpret the phrase "*idiotes* or unbeliever" as signifying two categories of non-Christians—the one favorably inclined to Christianity and possibly to the acceptance of baptism; the other class without this inclination. Verse 16 favors this interpretation. There the *idiotes* says "Amen" to the prayer of the one speaking in tongues, and is therefore acquainted with Christian customs.

The regulations of ceremonial purification led the Greeks and Romans to exclude the uninitiated from

---

tween that of a complete adherent and that of a complete outsider. In New Testament usage the term generally refers to a person favorably inclined to the faith, a prospective convert. Cf. Bauer, *Der Wortgottesdienst der ältesten Christen,* 1930, pp. 17 f.

[8] Cf. I Cor. 14: 16. Douay calls them "unlearned."

their sacred assemblies. They excluded all slaves and generally also women. This pagan exclusiveness gradually felt the influence of the Jewish proselytizing movement. The early Christian communities carried this movement still further as they emphasized moral rectitude rather than ceremonial purification. The Christian Church made no distinction between masters and slaves, men and women.[9]

This principle of equality in Christ is clearly set forth by St. Paul, who says in his Epistle to the Galatians: [10] "in Him is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female." Thus a slave, being a freedman of Christ Jesus,[11] may be prophet and teacher, he may bear in himself the gifts of the Spirit and may become a dispenser of them. The same principle applies to women.[12] Hence all classes were allowed to attend the divine worship and take part in it. The only restrictions are those dictated by the customary norms of proper behavior. Thus St. Paul prescribes that a woman praying or prophesying in public shall have her head covered, whereas a man shall have his head uncovered.[13] These restrictions, of course, do not abrogate the principle: no class of persons is to be regarded as ceremonially unclean, but all classes (including women, non-Christians, slaves, and children) are admitted to the Christian assemblies. St. Paul in his epistles, which

[9] Cf. I Tim. 2: 1–15; I Pet. 2: 13—3: 9.
[10] Gal. 3: 28.
[11] I Cor. 7: 22.
[12] I Cor. 11: 5.
[13] Cf. I Cor. 11: 1–16.

are to be read in the Christian meetings, explicitly addresses all these various classes.

The Jews had the custom of excommunicating from the synagogue those who were judged unworthy.[14] The Christians did likewise. In his First Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul rebukes the Corinthian Christians because they have not yet excommunicated the man who continued to be guilty of sins of unnatural lust. The Apostle then says: "As for myself, absent in body but present in spirit, I have already, as if really present, passed judgment in the name of the Lord Jesus upon him who hath thus wrought this deed—you and my own spirit being met together, along with the power of the Lord Jesus—deciding to deliver up such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." [15]

According to this passage St. Paul directs the community, which has been contaminated by the guilt of its sinful member, to meet in full assembly, and in the name of the Lord Jesus. This last phrase shows that the assembly is a liturgical gathering. This view is evident from Matt. 18: 20: "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there I am in the midst of them." Further, we know that public profession of belief in Christ as Lord was made in the liturgical assemblies and probably not elsewhere. In this full assembly of the community the Lord is present with His might, and Paul is present in spirit. The sentence of condemnation

[14] John 9: 22; 12: 42; 16: 2.
[15] I Cor. 5: 3 ff.

by the community will consequently have special force and importance. The sentence to be passed is one of complete excommunication.[16]

This act of excommunication is equivalent to delivering the culprit into the hands of Satan,[17] that the guilty man may thus suffer bodily affliction and thereby that his spirit may be saved. How this salvation is to be effected is not explicitly stated in the text. That he will be saved in the day of the Lord, harmonizes with other passages in this epistle.[18]

The excommunication to be carried out by the Christian community at Corinth is more severe than the treatment prescribed for an offending brother, as recorded by St. Matthew in his Gospel.[19] Nor are we to consider this case as merely individual and exceptional. From other words of St. Paul in this same chapter of his epistle we may infer that other heinous offenses, likewise calling for excommunication, were not unknown.[20] The words that St. Paul later in his letter devotes to charity are in sharp contrast to his severity in the case of the incestuous man. These two Pauline passages [21] are the root and the first expression of the later practice of the assembled community to pronounce judicial sentence [22] and to exclude public sinners.[23]

But we must add that St. Paul's words in II Corin-

[16] I Cor. 5: 7.
[17] Cf. II Cor. 2: 11; I Tim. 1: 20.
[18] I Cor. 3: 15; 11: 32.
[19] Matt. 18: 15 ff.
[20] I Cor. 5: 11.
[21] I Cor. 5: 3–5, 11.
[22] I Cor. 1: 1 ff.
[23] Cf. II Cor. 2: 1 f.

thians [24] moderate the harshness of the passages here in question. And his exhortation to let love prevail diminishes the danger that the community might abuse its power. The community should also remember the other admonition of the Apostle, namely, that the brother for whom Christ died should not be allowed to perish,[25] and should likewise remember the exhortation given in Rom. 12: 9–20, where the Apostle urges a generous exercise of charity. The highest law is that the spirit be saved.[26] Higher than all gifts of the Spirit stands charity. Only by charity can Christians, precisely because they are spiritual and should be mindful of their own weakness, bring back to the community those who have sinned.[27]

WOMEN IN DIVINE WORSHIP

In God and Christ, according to St. Paul, no distinction is to be made by reason of nationality, social status, or sex. The only standard is that based on religion. All believers are children of God because, having been baptized in Christ, they have put on Christ. In the Christian Church no distinction exists between Jew and Gentile, slave and free, man and woman; all are one in Christ Jesus.[28] In one of the morning prayers, the Israelite used to thank God that God had not made him a pagan, a slave, or a woman. Christians would never think of making such a prayer. St. Paul's position as to the equality

[24] II Cor. 2: 5 ff.
[25] I Cor. 8: 11.
[26] I Cor. 5: 5.
[27] Gal. 6: 1.
[28] Gal. 3: 26 ff.

of all before God leads to equality in the liturgical gatherings.

In fact, St. Paul explicitly states this position of equality with regard to men and women. From I Cor. 11: 5 we see that for a woman to pray or prophesy in the assembled community is taken as a matter of course. In Rom. 16: 1 the service rendered to the Church by Phoebe, a woman, is mentioned in terms equivalent to those which describe the activity of Stephanas in I Cor. 16: 15 f., where St. Paul says: "Ye know that the household of Stephanas are the firstfruits of Achaia, and have devoted themselves to the service of the saints; to such as these I exhort you on your part to be subject, and to every one that helpeth and shareth in the work." St. Paul's frequent praise of Christian women shows that, in the Apostle's esteem, they stand as high as men.

St. Paul is certainly generous in his praise of women in whose houses Christian meetings were held. This note of praise appears in the salutations of his letters and in the epithets he gives to such women. This pre-eminence, which such women enjoyed in relation to the community assembled in their houses, allows us the conjecture that such women were not forbidden some services in the ministry of the Church. We find this view confirmed by what is said of Priscilla, especially in Acts 18: 26: "This man (Apollo) now began to speak out in the synagogue; whereupon Priscilla and Aquila, hearing him, took him unto them and set before him more accurately the way of God." We have no reason to restrict this sort of activity to the present instance or to private instructions. The activity of this woman, whose

name invariably precedes that of her husband,[29] is said by Paul to be such that not only is he himself bound to gratitude, but all the Churches of the Gentiles.[30] That this gratitude is based chiefly on the help she gave St. Paul in spreading the Gospel, is evident from a consideration of the following passages: Acts 18: 18; I Cor. 16: 19; Rom. 16: 3 f.; II Tim. 4: 19.

What is said about Evodia and Syntyche in Phil. 4: 2 f., leads us to suppose that they, too, distinguished themselves in the service of the Gospel. We cannot understand how the words spoken of the work of these two women can be understood in any other sense than that assigned to the teaching activity of the men ("Clement and the rest") who are named together with them. Other women labored in similar fashion in the work of spreading the Gospel.[31] Since we have already noted that Christians retained much Jewish custom, we may note that also in the synagogues women were, for a time, allowed to be public readers of Scripture.

St. Paul's attitude is in accord with early Christian interpretation of the prophets. St. Peter, in his Pentecost sermon, quotes the prophet Joel, saying: "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams. Yea, upon My servants also and upon My handmaids in those days shall I pour forth of My spirit, and they shall prophesy." [32] The kernel of this prophecy is the religious equality of men and women. Hence we may

29 Cf. Acts 18: 18, 26.
30 Rom. 16: 4.
31 Rom. 16: 6 ff.; cf. 1 Cor. 16: 16; 1 Tim. 5: 17.
32 Acts 2: 17; cf. Joel 3: 1.

expect to find early Christianity welcoming women prophets as a fulfilment of that prediction. In fact, St. Paul explicitly mentions women prophets.[33]

One restriction St. Paul lays upon women prophesying in the assemblies: they must not do so with uncovered head. Apparently in the Church at Corinth some women claimed the right to address the assembly with uncovered head. Their claim may have been based on a false conception of Christian liberty, on misunderstood equality between the sexes. But the Apostle considers their procedure a danger to propriety. The reasons which he urges sound strange to our ears. But the Apostle's restriction implies his approval of women's prophesying in the Christian assemblies.

We quote in full the passage in which St. Paul commands women to have their heads covered. "The head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God. Any man that prayeth or prophesieth with his head covered dishonoreth his head. And any woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head: for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven. If a woman will not cover her head, she may as well cut off her hair; but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her keep her head covered. For a man ought not to cover his head, being as he is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man. For man is not from woman, but woman from man; for man was not created for the sake of woman, but woman for the sake of man. Therefore a woman ought to have a veil over

[33] I Cor. 11: 5.

her head, because of the angels. Yet, in the Lord, neither is woman without man, nor man without woman. For as woman is from man, so is man through woman, yea, and all things are from God. Judge for yourselves. Is it seemly that a woman pray to God uncovered? Doth not nature herself teach you that it is shameful for a man to wear long hair, while to wear long hair is a woman's glory? For her hair hath been given her for a mantle. But if anyone is minded to be contentious—we have no such custom, neither have the churches of God." [34]

In this rabbinical method of exegesis all details, even the smallest, are worthy of consideration. Here the most important point is that man was created first and directly. We of today are unable to grasp the significance of certain points in this argumentation. How is the lack of covering on a woman's head a dishonor to her husband; and how is the wearing of a head covering by a man a dishonor to Christ? In what sense is the woman the glory of man, and why must she for this reason have her head covered? Furthermore, why is the woman's veil a sign of her dependence? But we have no difficulty in understanding the force of St. Paul's argument when he bases woman's subordination on the order of creation.

But this whole passage differs from St. Paul's expression of the fundamental Christian principle.[35] It approaches the rabbinic depreciation of woman. Let us note that man is called the image and glory of God, whereas woman is called the glory of man. We have a series—God, Christ, man, woman—in which each of

[34] I Cor. 11: 3–16.
[35] Gal. 3: 28.

the first three is called the head of the one which follows. True, we do not know many of the circumstances of this part of the letter. But this passage is not so much a statement of standards as it is a personal warning against practices that might endanger the accepted propriety of good behavior. The development which begins here is contrary to what we would have expected from the principle enunciated in Gal. 3: 20, where the religious equality of men and women is recognized as a principle; consequently their equality in liturgical matters.

"Judge for yourselves," says St. Paul; "is it seemly that a woman pray to God uncovered?" [36] These words give us the impression that in the Church at Corinth serious abuses must have crept in, which stirred St. Paul's indignation.[37] Elsewhere in the same chapter (verses 5 and 6) St. Paul's words reflect a rabbinical attitude. The order of creation, which is from God, here prompts St. Paul to supplement what he said in Gal. 3: 28 about the equality of women. In correcting the abuses just referred to, St. Paul directs that women, in view of the order of creation, shall have a veil on their heads on account of the angels.

In the original text the word that we translate "veil" has always been a matter of difficulty for exegetes. Recently Kittel [38] has, to my mind, solved the difficulty.

[36] I Cor. 11: 13.

[37] Before the Babylonian Captivity the Jewish practice was to pray with the head uncovered. After the Captivity the available evidence seems to point to a contrary practice. Later the practice must have reverted to the earlier one. In fact, St. Paul explicitly admonishes the women not to imitate the practice of the men, which was to pray with the head uncovered.

[38] "Die 'Macht' auf dem Haupte" in *Rabbinica,* 1920, pp. 17–31. Cf. Herklotz, *Biblische Zeitschrift,* X (1912), 154, note.

He proves that the word does not mean "a power" over her head, but simply a covering or veil. But Kittel's interpretation of the phrase "on account of the angels" cannot be accepted. According to him "the angels" here are "the guardian angels" of the woman in reverence for whom she should be veiled. The context refutes this opinion. In St. Paul's mind the angels are guardians of the order of creation.[39]

Some scholars have held, arguing from the sixth chapter of Genesis, that the angels here referred to are bad angels. We cannot admit this view. In Jewish sources at the time of Christ we find no indication of an interpretation of "sons of God" as meaning "angels." Further, our text refers chiefly to married women.[40] Again, the word "angel," used without qualification, signifies in New Testament usage a good angel, not a demon. The view that the veil was regarded as a protective defense against evil spirits, has not been established.[41] The use of the word "angels" as guardians of the order of creation is well established in the New Testament.[42]

Summarizing our comment on I Cor. 11: 2–16, we may say that St. Paul acknowledges woman's right to appear in the liturgical assemblies as teacher, but she must observe the custom of having her head covered.

We must now consider another text from the same epistle. "Let women be silent in the churches, for it is

39 Cf. Prat, *op. cit.*, I, 121.

40 From Tertullian we learn that St. Paul's words were quoted by those who claimed that unmarried women might come to church with heads uncovered. *De Oratione*, c. 21. (*PL*, I, 1184).

41 See *supra*, note 38.

42 See Gal. 3: 19; I Cor. 4: 9; cf. Acts 7: 38, 53; Heb. 2: 2.

not allowed them to speak in public; but let them be submissive, as also saith the Law. If they would seek some information, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in church." [43]

We must first notice the context. St. Paul is expressing his wish that all things be done becomingly and in order.[44] From his pen this thought is frequent, namely, that inward Christian life should be reflected outwardly in well-ordered behavior.[45] Such orderly conduct gives him joy.[46] He recognizes, as an element of this good order, that not all are apostles, not all are prophets, not all are teachers. He condemns excessive esteem for the spiritual gifts and also failure to appreciate the special value of each gift. The relation of members to a body is the image by which he expresses the relation which individuals possessing the gifts have to the community. He admonishes all that no one shall be ambitious for a higher place than belongs to him by his relation to the body of Christ.[47]

In accordance with this principle he now regulates the manner in which those who have the gifts shall exercise them in the public assembly. The passage about women remaining silent in the church must be understood in the light of this principle. Two explanations are possible.

When St. Paul says: "It is shameful for a woman to

[43] I Cor. 14: 34 f.
[44] I Cor. 14: 40.
[45] Rom. 13: 13; I Thess. 4: 12.
[46] Col. 2: 5.
[47] Rom. 12: 3 ff.; I Cor. 4: 6; 12: 10–31.

speak in church," what does he mean by "speak"? Those scholars are mistaken who maintain that in this passage "speak" signifies, as opposed to "prophesy," "speak" in the ordinary sense. This same Greek verb is used by St. Paul and St. Luke in the sense of speaking in the Spirit.[48] The context, both remote and proximate, refutes their view. In chapter 11 the Apostle sanctions the practice of allowing women even to "prophesy" in the church. When, therefore, in the present context he forbids women "to speak," the term "to speak" cannot be understood either as prophetic speech or as speech in the ordinary sense. In what third sense, then, are we to understand the term?

In this passage St. Paul is regulating the exercise of two spiritual gifts, the gift of tongues and the gift of prophecy. As regards the gift of tongues, he allows only two or three to speak in turn. Further, if no interpreter is present, those with this gift shall keep silent. Likewise as regards the prophets, only two or three are allowed to speak, and those who do speak must be "discerned" by others. While a prophet is speaking, if another has a spiritual message to impart, the prophet must cease speaking. In this way St. Paul seeks to bring order into the public assemblies. Who are the "discerners" referred to? The term cannot be restricted to other prophets. Such restriction disagrees with the immediate context. The Apostle says: "Ye can thus all prophesy." It disagrees also with St. Paul's usage in I Thess. 5: 20.

Since women are allowed to prophesy but are here commanded to keep silent and to obtain explanations

[48] E. g., Acts 3: 21, 24; 4: 31, 33; I Cor. 2: 7.

from their husbands at home, we must suppose that the Christian women at Corinth, regarding themselves as "discerners," asked questions for their own information. To correct this disorder which arose from an exaggerated regard for the gifts, St. Paul directs the Corinthians to observe the custom elsewhere prevalent, namely, that women shall not be allowed to pass judgment on the utterances of the prophets. Another and more probable explanation is the following.

In other communities women were obliged to be silent in the public assemblies. This fact accords with what St. Peter says about woman's vocation and manner of living. He says: "Let wives be subject to their husbands: that if any believe not the word, they may be won without the word, by the wives' manner of life, considering your chaste conduct with fear; whose adorning let it not be the outward plaiting of the hair or the wearing of gold or the putting on of apparel, but the hidden man of the heart in the incorruptibility of a quiet and meek spirit." [49]

Against the first interpretation of I Cor. 14: 33–35, quoted above on page 361, one serious doubt remains. St. Paul says: "It is shameful for a woman to speak in church." [50] What is the exact meaning of these words? De Groot [51] proposes a new translation, namely, "It is shameful to speak to a woman in a church." But this view has no foundation in the present passage, which forbids to women all initiative, even that of speaking. Some

[49] I Pet. 3: 1 ff.

[50] I Cor. 14: 35.

[51] *Theol. Studien,* 1914, pp. 245–47; cf. also *Biblische Zeitschrift,* XIII (1915), 189.

scholars attempt to solve the difficulty by saying that verses 34 and 35 are an interpolation, possibly based on a marginal note to I Tim. 2: 11 f. This proposal seems to be subject to many objections from the viewpoint of textual criticism. Hence we hold that St. Paul, who had indeed permitted prophesying by women, was led either by abuses in the community or more probably by Jewish rabbinic preoccupations, to demand of the woman absolute silence in the liturgical assemblies. If we admit this view, then his word in 11: 5 (on women prophesying) must be regarded as an exception. And what St. Paul says in I Tim. 2: 11 f., where women are allowed to learn but in no way to teach, would strengthen this conclusion.

This passage is worded as follows: "Let a woman learn quietly, with entire submission. I do not allow a woman to teach, or to have the mastery over a man; she is to be quiet. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman who, being deluded, fell into transgression. Nevertheless women shall be saved through childbearing, if they abide in faith and charity and holiness, with self-control."

Here, as in I Corinthians, we are told that woman's position is one of subjection to man. In both passages the argument is based on the order of creation. The passage from I Timothy adds that the first to fall into sin was woman.[52] This thought is St. Paul's reason for saying that she is not fitted to teach, but only to be taught.

May we understand this passage in I Timothy, which concerns woman's speaking, as restricting her right only

52 I Tim. 2: 14.

in the matter of exercising the gift of discernment? We should not so understand it. St. Paul's words are "with entire submission." The only religious vocation that St. Paul here assigns to woman is that of being saved through childbearing. This passage lays on woman an absolute command of silence which excludes her from any active participation in the liturgical assembly. The more the passage insists on woman's dignity as a mother, the more it subordinates her to man so far as liturgical functions are concerned. Yet we should bear in mind that St. Paul has laid down the principle that woman is the equal of man in the matter of spiritual capacity and destiny.

In this regard, as in so many other liturgical regulations, Christians preserved the ancient Jewish conceptions and customs. We do not have a complete knowledge of the religious and liturgical position of woman in Judaism. But this much we know clearly, that she had merely a subordinate position in the Jewish liturgy, on account of the Jewish view that motherhood was her highest claim to consideration. Some scholars have maintained that in the Old Testament only a few women are described as being devout and religious and therefore we may infer that they were excluded from any active function in public worship. This opinion cannot be accepted.[53] Still it is true that the earliest Jewish liturgical prescriptions are addressed exclusively to men. For example, all the men are commanded to appear before the Lord three times a year.[54] In later Jewish

[53] See Löhr, *Die Stellung des Weibes,* 1908, pp. 32–57.
[54] Ex. 23: 17; 34: 23; Deut. 16: 16.

religious development, the women, unlike the men, were not allowed to approach near the holy place of sacrifice; in fact, they must not pass beyond the limits of the women's court in the Temple.

Another evidence of the exclusion of women from Jewish liturgical life and from the priesthood appears in the religious significance of circumcision. Sacrifice, the most important religious function, was exclusively the office of men. We find no reference anywhere to a sacrificial act performed by a woman. Furthermore, women's ritualistic uncleanness, arising from aspects of her sexual life, tended to exclude her from presence in the sanctuary and of course from the priestly office. Thus even men, after sexual contact, were Levitically unclean and were excluded from the privileges of the sanctuary.[55]

After the development of the synagogue women were allowed some share in divine worship. The reason for this was the greater emphasis laid on "spiritual worship." But women at that time still had no obligation to say the daily prayers or to observe other liturgical prescriptions. They were at times allowed to read the Scriptures in the synagogue. This practice may have been an historical reminiscence of the time when women were prophets.[56]

In contrast to this attitude of Judaism, St. Paul explicitly declares women's complete religious equality with men. This declaration in principle opens to women the path to the sanctuary and to everything liturgical.

[55] Ex. 19: 15; Lev. 15: 16; I Kings 21: 5; Ezech. 36: 17 ff.
[56] Ex. 15: 20; IV Kings 22: 15; Ezech. 13: 17 ff.

But in other passages his modifications of this principle were probably prompted by the influence of Jewish custom. On this point Christ had said nothing. "He found no occasion to alter the Old Law in this matter." [57] Hence the early Christians did not find in our Lord's teaching any basis for developing women's religious equality into liturgical equality.

DEMEANOR OF PARTICIPANTS

Well-ordered behavior is a principle of all Christian life.[58] This principle finds a special application in public worship.[59] Such conduct is not a matter of mere legislation, but of conformity with what belongs to the spirit of God.[60] From this inner spirit which Christians possess [61] flows the outward formation in Christ.[62] In regulated behavior the fulness of the Christian spirit finds restraint which keeps it from falling into unregulated individualism.[63]

The chief passages in which St. Paul applies this principle to the liturgy are chapters 11 and 14 of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Another important passage is II Cor. 6: 16, where St. Paul regulates the Christian attitude toward pagan sacrifices. In all these passages external order is declared to be the expression of internal disposition. Hence certain questions asked by

[57] Holzmeister, *Stimmen der Zeit,* CIII (1922), 52.
[58] Cf. Rom. 13: 1; I Thess. 4: 12.
[59] I Cor. 14: 40.
[60] I Cor. 14: 33.
[61] I Cor. 14: 37; Eph. 2: 19 ff.
[62] Gal. 4: 19.
[63] I Cor. 3: 16 f.; 6: 19.

modern scholars are futile. For instance, the question whether originally the spirit was intolerant of restraining prescriptions. A similar question is, "whether the essence of Church law is in contradiction with the essence of the Church." [64]

St. Paul, in developing his principle, does not employ legal phrases. He simply shows how the new Christian life unfolds. The image which he uses is that of a foundation on which the edifice is to be erected. Christians are a holy temple, built upon Christ as the foundation.[65]

St. Paul's image of a building and its construction is frequent in his writings. This figure he applies to the question of the observance of special days and to the question of certain foods, admonishing Christians to be mindful of peace and of the duty to aid in the building up of one another.[66]

The strong must not be selfish but must help in the building up of their weak brethren.[67] For a Christian the important question is not whether a thing is permissible, but rather whether it serves for this building up.[68] Having Christ as their foundation, Christians must build up one another on that foundation.[69]

In the fourteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where St. Paul regulates the use of the spiritual gifts, the frequent theme is mutual building

64 See Kattenbusch, *Der Quellort der Kirchenidee*, 1921, p. 143. He adds these words: "Order brings with it compulsion. The Spirit is compelled to insist in some way on 'human' forms of behavior."

65 I Cor. 3: 9 ff.; Eph. 2: 20 f.; Col. 2: 7; cf. I Pet. 2: 5.

66 Rom. 14: 10.

67 Rom. 15: 2.

68 I Cor. 10: 23 f.

69 I Thess. 5: 11.

up of one another (verses 3–5, 12, 17, 26). Thus, says the Apostle, all things will be done fittingly and in good order. The power which God has given him, St. Paul speaks of in terms of architecture.[70] He himself is the architect. All that he does, all that he writes, contributes to the work of building up.[71] All preachers of the Gospel engage in the building up of the body of Christ.[72]

The law of the mutual "building up" of God's house binds not only the preachers of the Gospel but all Christians. Within the limits of this cooperation, Christian freedom can develop to the full. The building up of the Church outweighs the building up of oneself.[73] This work is the task of the various gifts. One gift stands higher than another in the degree to which it performs this task in divine worship.[74] All these preceding considerations are summed up in St. Paul's words, "Let everything be done unto up-building."[75] However, St. Paul does not object to the creative manifestations of the new spirit.[76]

This upbuilding is impossible without charity. That charity builds up[77] is St. Paul's conviction. On this principle he bases his condemnation of the intellectual pride of the Corinthians, who are without consider-

[70] I Cor. 3: 9; II Cor. 10: 8.
[71] II Cor. 12: 19; 13: 10.
[72] Eph. 4: 12 ff.
[73] I Cor. 14: 4.
[74] I Cor., chap. 14.
[75] I Cor. 14: 26.
[76] I Cor. 14: 39; I Thess. 5: 19.
[77] I Cor. 8: 1.

ation for the unlearned. The Apostle says: "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity buildeth up." Conceit is an evil trait in those whom he is addressing.[78] One exalts himself above another instead of building him up.

We must suppose that the Corinthian gnostics employed St. Paul's term, "building up," as their own word to express the effect of the gnosis which they so highly praised. Without this supposition we cannot understand St. Paul's ironical sentence in I Cor. 8: 10: "If someone behold thee, who art well instructed, at table in an idol-place, will not his conscience, weak as he is, be built up[79] to eat things sacrificed to the idols?" This sentence enables us to understand better St. Paul's contrast between gnosis and love, when he says: "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity buildeth up."

From the concluding words of this chapter 8, we see that the Apostle is using the word "charity" especially in the sense of fraternal charity. The gnosis, which the Corinthians are so proud of, will not build up the weak brother unless these gnostics themselves are guided by charity, especially in their conduct in matters religious. Otherwise the gnosis is only sham. Such a gnostic "hath not yet come to know as he ought to know," that is, he has not fulfilled the conditions which lead to true, genuine knowledge, which is ethical as well as intellectual. But this love of neighbor is a fruit of the love of God. "If anyone love God, the same is known by Him."[80]

[78] I Cor. 4: 6, 18; 5: 2.
[79] In Greek, *οἰκοδομηθήσεται.*
[80] I Cor. 8: 3; cf. 8: 11 f.

These passages reveal St. Paul as a mystic, whose greatest desire is to know God fully, even as he himself is fully known by God.[81]

All other things—all gifts of the Spirit, gnosis itself—come to an end; only love remains imperishable. Hence for a Christian in his relation to God and Christ and therefore to the liturgy, the paramount question is not what food he eats, what days he observes, what liberties he exercises, what gifts he possesses. It is rather whether he injures charity or preserves it.[82] Love is the measure and the bond of that freedom to which all Christians have been called.[83] This principle holds good and has its greatest glory in the Christian liturgy, which is the bond uniting the community with God and Christ. Hence St. Paul condemns severely the violation of charity when selfishness appears even in the community meal.[84]

In order to put an end to these abuses, the Apostle appeals to the highest motives, these two: his personal relation to the community and the new relation which all Christians have to God in Christ. He points to the scandal given to the community of God by those who do not walk in the footsteps of the Apostle, who himself is following Jesus. Hence his weighty words that reveal his own interior life and his most personal relation to the community: "Be ye followers of me as I am of Christ." [85] In the Epistle to the Ephesians we read: "Be ye imitators

[81] Cf. I Cor. 13: 12.
[82] Rom. 14: 15; I Cor. 10: 23—11: 1.
[83] Gal. 5: 13.
[84] I Cor. 11: 23 ff.
[85] I Cor. 10: 33—11: 1.

of God, as well-beloved children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved you and delivered up Himself for us, an offering and sacrifice of sweet savor to God." [86] These phrases are taken partly from the Jewish liturgy. They are similar to our Lord's own words about love: "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." [87]

Love is the bond of perfection.[88] This principle St. Paul applies in I Cor. 14: 33 (cf. Jude 20) to the Christian liturgy, urging Christians to take God as their model in unity and mutual love. St. Paul here was but imitating Christ, who gave His own example to His disciples as the model of devoted love. The memory of this example was kept alive by the early Christian practice of hospitality, and especially by the continued performance of that symbolic act—the washing of the Apostles' feet—which Christ had called the special expression of His own disposition.[89]

St. John's account of the washing of the Apostles' feet has received various interpretations. The only interpretation justified by the context is that our Lord's act on this occasion was a symbol and example of loving service. Tillmann expresses this interpretation as follows: "The disciple of the Lord must, in serving his brother, exclude any desire for commendation. He must not insist on the dignity of his own position. He must have an unselfish humility and a magnanimous spirit of service." [90] St. Paul is walking in the footsteps of Christ

[86] Eph. 5: 1 f.
[87] Matt. 5: 48.
[88] Col. 3: 14.
[89] John 13: 12 ff.; cf. Rom. 12: 13; I Tim. 3: 2; 5: 10.
[90] Tillmann, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1931, p. 250.

when he says: "Be ye followers of me as I am of Christ." The pursuit of charity [91] is pre-eminently the Christian way [92] which leads to peace in Christ.[93]

St. Paul's words just quoted show the close connection between the liturgy and the individual personal worship expressed in Christian life. On this point we need add little to what we have already said. For scholars who are investigating the words of Christ and the events of His life as recorded in the Gospels, recent studies have shown the importance of established literary forms of expression. These forms have a significance not merely in the realm of preaching, of apologetics, and of doctrine; they enable us to penetrate more profoundly into the minds of the disciples who witnessed His deeds and heard His very words. Studied from this viewpoint, many parts of the Gospels appear in a new light.[94]

The value of this approach has been exaggerated by some scholars. Likewise the notion of liturgy has been too widely extended. This happens when it is applied outside of questions having to do with the relation which Christ established between men and the kingdom of God. Notwithstanding these exaggerations, we can obtain new light in our understanding of the New Testament if we thus study, not merely the contemporary Jewish and pagan liturgies, but also the newly formed Christian liturgy. In this manner we perceive that phrases like those of St. Paul mentioned above, about

[91] I Cor. 14: 1.
[92] I Cor. 13: 1.
[93] Col. 3: 14 f.
[94] See, e. g., Martin Dibelius, *Formgeschichte des Evangeliums,* 1919.

the importance of being followers of Christ, have both a liturgical and a moral content. Christian ethics is closely associated with Christian liturgy. Christian moral living is a worship of God. By "the following of Christ" St. Paul and the early Christians meant both liturgy and moral conduct as expressing and proclaiming Christ, especially His suffering and death.

The early Christian assemblies, animated by charity, were joyful. Conspicuous evidence of this fact we find in the Epistle to the Philippians. We are the more touched by the note of joy in this epistle when we remember that St. Paul was at that time in bands for the Gospel. The Jewish liturgy itself had a spirit of joy.[95] How much more, then, was the Christian liturgy dominated by a spirit of joy! St. Paul adds an admonition that Christians should be of one heart and soul [96] because without this inner unity they will be unable to have an outward unity in their liturgical worship and praise of God. The joy of the early Christian liturgy is evidenced by the whole New Testament and is made explicit by passages like Eph. 5: 18–20 and Col. 3: 16.

We must note one more expression of the spirit that united Christians. We refer to the phrase "greet one another with a holy kiss." [97] In all likelihood this expression refers to the liturgical assemblies, since these letters were intended to be read publicly. The adjective "holy" excludes a profane meaning from the word "kiss" and gives it a religious consecration and a liturgical

[95] Deut. 14: 26; I Kings 1: 4; 16: 2; II Kings 6: 5, 19; Ps. 26: 6; 32: 3; 46: 2; 97: 8; Is. 55: 12; II Esd. 8: 10.

[96] Rom. 15: 5–13.

[97] Rom. 16: 16; I Cor. 16: 20; II Cor. 13: 12; I Thess. 5: 26; I Pet. 5: 14.

character. It has its fullest meaning in the Lord's Supper.[98]

A comprehensive term which embraces all St. Paul's admonitions about correct behavior at the Christian meetings for divine service, is found in I Tim. 2: 2. In that passage St. Paul uses the word "piety." "It means behavior liturgically becoming and pleasing to God." [99]

To conclude our considerations about the conduct at the liturgical assemblies, we now wish to consider briefly three details: clothing, posture, and tone of voice. Generally the worshipers probably wore white garments. The Apocalypse, which reflects liturgical usage, frequently mentions the wearing of white garments.[100] In apocalyptical literature, the color white is often introduced.[101] Apart from the Book of the Apocalypse, in the New Testament this color is associated with divine and angelic apparitions.[102] In pagan religions white was the color signifying ritualistic purity. To the religious feasts of Rome the citizens thronged in their white togas, thus giving the city the name of "urbs candida." [103] The Jewish practice of having fringes on their mantles was probably continued by the early Christians, since most likely Christ Himself had observed the custom and since the Jewish converts were still zealous for the Mosaic

[98] See especially Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, p. 229.
[99] Franz Köhler, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 1917, p. 414.
[100] Apoc. 3: 4 f.; 3: 18; 4: 4; 6: 11; 7: 9, 13.
[101] V Esdras 2: 39 f.; 2: 45; Ascension of Isaias 4: 6; 8: 26; 9: 2, 9, 11, 18; Henaeth 62: 15 f., 90.
[102] Matt. 17: 2; Mark 9: 2; Luke 9: 29; John 20: 12; Acts 1: 10.
[103] Cf. E. B. Allo, *Saint Jean, L'Apocalypse*, 1921, pp. 48–50.

Law.[104] At prayer the men had their heads uncovered, the women covered.[105]

They prayed with uplifted hands.[106] This practice was an ancient custom of the Jews, among whom the phrases, "to lift one's hands" and "to stretch out one's hands," were expressions of prayer.[107] Generally they stood when praying.[108] Under the stress of strong feeling they sometimes fell prostrate on the ground.[109] Kneeling is mentioned in various passages, as, for example, Mark 15: 19; Luke 5: 8; Acts 20: 36; 21: 5; cf. 9: 40; Rom. 14: 11; Phil. 2: 10; Eph. 3: 14. The Jews, in the synagogue, after the Scripture reading, used to kneel down during their recitation of certain prayers for various classes. These prayers bore a resemblance to some of the petitions of our litany.

Those prophesying, preaching, or reading the Scriptures stood up, while their listeners were seated. In the Christian assemblies some places were seats of honor.[110] At the celebration of the Lord's Supper, as we have already said, those present, in accordance with the practice of the time, used to recline at table.

Like the Jews [111] and others,[112] the Christians recited prayers aloud.[113] Short ejaculations were frequent dur-

104 Acts 21: 20.
105 I Cor. 11: 5.
106 I Tim. 2: 8.
107 Fried. Heiler, *Das Gebet*, 1923, p. 101.
108 Matt. 6: 5; Mark 11: 25; Luke 18: 11, 13.
109 Matt. 17: 6; 26: 39; I Cor. 14: 25.
110 Jas. 2: 3 f.; cf. Matt. 23: 6.
111 Döller, *Das Gebet im Alten Testament*, 1914, pp. 69, 93.
112 Ansfeld, *in Jahrb. f. klass. Philologie*, S.B., XXVIII (1903), 514.
113 Cf. Rom. 15: 6; Phil. 2: 11; Jas. 3: 9.

ing the liturgical prayers.[114] Possibly the phrase, "Come Lord Jesus, come," [115] is such an early Christian ejaculation. This petition expressed the Christians' longing for the coming of Jesus, the first and the last, the beginning and the end, the morning star.[116] The closing verses of the Apocalypse express this same longing, which was prominent in the feelings of the early Christians.[117] These passages and others like them, especially I Cor. 7: 29–36 and the First Epistle of St. John, confirm what we have said about the following of Christ being regarded as at the same time a question of liturgy and a question of Christian moral life.

[114] I Cor. 12: 3; 14: 16.
[115] Apoc. 22: 20.
[116] Apoc. 22: 13, 16 f.
[117] Cf. I Pet. 1: 7 f.

CHAPTER XXIV

REGULATION OF LITURGICAL WORSHIP

ST. PAUL says: "When you come together, each one hath his own gift: a canticle, an instruction, a revelation, a tongue, an interpretation." [1] This passage, as we see from its context, shows that each one present contributed his personal share to the contents and order of the liturgy. St. Paul does not alter this practice. He merely directs that all shall be done to mutual edification and upbuilding. Only in the case of disorders does he impose restriction. But we note that he addresses these admonitions to the whole community, which he makes responsible for the carrying out of his instruction. Thus the faithful retained a freedom of participation in the liturgy. Even women exercised this freedom, which, however, became more and more restricted as time went on.[2]

Even without St. Paul's words, quoted above, our knowledge of the very earliest Christian attitude and practice would lead us to expect that every Christian man or woman may be the medium of direct revelations. These revelations were expressed in prayers, prophe-

1 I Cor. 14: 26.
2 I Cor. 11: 5; 14: 35 f.

cies, tongues, and other manifestations of the Spirit. All present participated by signifying their approval.[3]

This freedom of expression by everyone who participated in the liturgy is the background of this fourteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. With the good of the community in view, the Apostle says that all these manifestations of the Spirit should be intelligible to all who are present. This very admonition implies universal freedom of expression and the absence of an established order. We have more than once remarked above that the development of this freedom was favored by the Pentecost narrative in the Acts of the Apostles (chapter 2) and especially by St. Peter's application of Joel 3: 1–5 to all members of the Messianic kingdom.

St. Paul, in chapters 10 and 11 of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, speaks at some length of the celebration of the Lord's Supper. In this epistle he is addressing the entire Christian community at Corinth. His words do not indicate explicitly that there were officials vested with authority. Of course, details of preparation and service required that certain individuals perform specific duties. In the "breaking of bread" [4] at the common meal all might indeed say the words, but only one performed the act. St. Paul, however, since he is addressing the whole community, directs attention mainly to the mutual service of its members, including those who performed any special office. He even calls himself their "fellow-worker," not lording it over them.[5]

[3] Rom. 8: 16, 26; I Cor. 12: 10; 14: 29; I Thess. 5: 19.
[4] I Cor. 10: 16.
[5] Cf. II Cor. I: 23; 2: 1.

St. Peter expresses the same idea, calling himself a "fellow presbyter" and exhorting the other presbyters as follows: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking care of it, not by constraint, but willingly, according to God: not for filthy lucre's sake, but voluntarily: neither as lording it over the portion entrusted to you, but being made a pattern of the flock from the heart." [6]

In the First Epistle to Timothy, St. Paul assumes the same point of view. He says: "These things enjoin and teach. Let no one despise thee for thy youth; but become a pattern for the faithful in word, conduct, charity, faith, and chastity. Until I come, attend to reading, to exhortation, to teaching. Neglect not that grace in thee, which was given thee through prophecy with the laying on of the presbyters' hands. These things do thou practice: give thyself wholly to them: in order that thy progress be manifest to all. Look well to thyself and to thy teaching, and persevere thus; for in so doing thou shalt save both thyself and thy hearers." [7]

We are not to suppose that the Christian assemblies were ruled over by those who had the spiritual gifts to which we have often referred. St. Paul again and again, particularly in I Corinthians, chapters 12 to 14, maintains the eminent value of charity and of life in the service of charity. His attitude "was in opposition to the usual contemporary regard for religious aristocracy." [8] Charity, not the charismata, is what upbuilds fellow

[6] I Pet. 5: 2 f.
[7] I Tim. 4: 11 ff.
[8] Weinel, *Biblische Theologie,* 1921, p. 336.

Christians and unbelievers. A Christian is to be esteemed on account of his service of charity, rather than on account of his charismata.[9] Christians, instead of desiring vainglory, provoking one another and envying one another, should bear one another's burdens. Thus they will fulfil the law of Christ.[10]

Charity, rather than the spiritual gifts, is the source of unity. St. Paul develops this idea in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians. All Christians are one body and one spirit, in one Lord, one faith, one baptism, in one God and Father of all. From other passages in this chapter we see that the charismata bestowed no preeminence in the Christian communities. The various gifts are enumerated, as indicating not their relative importance, but their common value to the Christian community. "To every one of us is given grace according to the measure of Christ's bestowing" (verse 7). Gifts and graces vary but none of them has a privilege above the others. All of them serve to bring the community to "the full measure of the full stature of Christ" (verse 13).

We do not mean that these gifts were lightly regarded in the early Church. They were looked upon as important.[11] St. Paul himself considered that his possession of the gifts was evidence of his apostolate.[12] What kept the charismata from going beyond reasonable bounds was the thought that the bestower of the gifts was the God of charity and order and unity. Thus we find St. Paul in

[9] I Thess. 5: 12.
[10] Cf. Gal. 6: 1 ff.
[11] I Cor. 12: 7 ff.; Eph. 4: 1 ff.; I Thess. 5: 19 f.
[12] Rom. 15: 18 f.; I Cor. 14: 6, 18; II Cor. 12: 1 ff.

his Epistle to the Galatians [13] calling attention to the unity of all Christians in Christ. In Eph. 2: 18, St. Paul says that all Christians have immediate access to the Father.[14] St. Peter [15] speaks of the holy and royal priesthood which all Christians have.[16]

Many passages of the New Testament speak of the spiritual temple which Christians form.[17] This conception of all sons of God as one in Christ, of the Christian community as a sacred priesthood and spiritual temple, must to those who were familiar with the Temple as the proper place for worshiping Jahve and with the official priesthood as bearers of this worship, have had this meaning only: that the people of the New Covenant are the heirs of the Temple and take over the privileges of the ancient priesthood, entering by the one mediator Christ [18] into immediate union with God.

This mediation of Christ is again formulated in I Tim. 2: 5. But this mediation does not exclude the office of mediator by members of Christ, between man and God. Rather, even in New Testament passages which do not speak explicitly of the office of priesthood in the sense of the Old Testament liturgical priesthood, we may still trace the influence of the Jewish liturgy in the formation of early Christian liturgy.

The symbolism of the laying on of hands, already found in the Old Testament, and the services required

13 Gal. 3: 26 ff.
14 Cf. Rom. 5: 1.
15 I Pet. 2: 5 ff.
16 Cf. Apoc. 1: 6.
17 I Cor. 3: 16; II Cor. 6: 16; Eph. 2: 21 f.; Heb. 3: 6; I Pet. 2: 5.
18 Heb. 4: 14; 8: 1 f.; 9: 11.

by the celebration of the Lord's Supper, together with other events and developments, led through specifically Christian attitudes to clearly defined direction of the liturgical assemblies and to the foundation [19] of a priesthood in the strict sense. For the period covered by the New Testament we find the following details.

The Apostles were called directly by Christ.[20] They were the original and authentic witnesses of the Lord. From the entire number of Christians they selected those whom they wished to send forth for the preaching of the Gospel.[21] These collaborators in Apostolic preaching are called prophets and teachers.[22] These helpers shared in the authority of the Apostles themselves.[23] Possibly from the very outset they were assigned to definite localities. Their work is described by St. Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians. It was the work of building up the body of Christ. They exercised their liturgical functions by reading the Scripture and preaching in the assemblies. The authority which they had received

[19] Translator's note on the New Testament and the priesthood. "Our Lord . . . at the Last Supper . . . offered his body and blood to God the Father under the species of bread and wine, and under the symbols of these same things He gave His body and blood to His Apostles whom He at that time made priests. And by the words, 'Do this in commemoration of Me,' He laid on the Apostles, and on their successors in the priesthood, the command to offer sacrifice as He had done." Had our author but quoted these words of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. 1), he would have made his task easier. The author's use of the word "foundation" here is somewhat inexact. Since he presupposes Christ as the source of the liturgy, in the present passage he may be referring merely to the development of the priesthood.

[20] Luke 6: 13; Acts 9: 5, 15.

[21] Acts 13: 2 f.; 14: 23; 15: 22; cf. II Cor. 11: 13.

[22] I Cor. 12: 28; Eph. 4: 11 f.

[23] A list of these passages will be found in Dunin Borkowski, "Die Kirche als Stiftung Jesu" (Esser-Mausbach, *Religion, Christentum, Kirche,* 1920, II, 141 note 10).

from the Apostles would be recognized in the assemblies. Thus we find St. Paul saying that presbyters who rule well should be held worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in preaching and teaching.[24] This authority was not restricted to these helpers, but was transmitted from them to others.[25]

The Jewish synagogue had its official leaders for its services. Likewise in the New Testament we find those who exercised these functions and are called elders and presidents. Thus we find St. Paul [26] beseeching the Christians to appreciate the presidents who toil among them, to esteem them highly and lovingly. Again he urges the Corinthians to be subject to every one that helpeth in the work.[27] In the Epistle to the Hebrews we find a similar admonition: "Be mindful of your superiors, who spoke to you the word of God. Consider the close of their career, and imitate their faith." [28] Elsewhere similar exhortations are addressed to the presidents themselves. St. Paul says to Archippus: "Look to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it." [29] Many such exhortations are found in the pastoral epistles.[30]

These helpers performed different kinds of services. They did more than merely preach the word. St. Paul enumerates [31] these services. (Rom. 12: 7 f.) There were

24 I Tim. 5: 17; cf. II Tim. 2: 2.
25 II Tim. 2: 2.
26 I Thess. 5: 12.
27 I Cor. 16: 16.
28 Heb. 13: 7.
29 Col. 4: 17.
30 E. g., II Tim. 2: 24; cf. Apoc. 1: 1.
31 See *Catholic Encyclopedia, s. v.* Hierarchy.

administrators, teachers, exhorters, table-masters, almsgivers, and presiders.

St. Paul gives us a list of the qualities which these helpers should have.[32] A person having these qualities might rightly aspire to any of these offices, including that of overseer.[33] The community had the duty of providing for the needs of such a one.[34] In the light of this development we cannot doubt that Christian communities were under the guidance of special officials, particularly in their liturgical assemblies. Various names are used to designate these helpers. They are called presiders, leaders, servers, presbyters,[35] and overseers.[36]

One more term remains to be considered, that of the founder or patron of each Christian local community. Often he was the first convert in the locality and offered his house as the meeting place of the Christians. We may understand something of his importance if we reflect on the honored position, even in religious matters, of the head of the family among the Jews. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul praises such a patron, Stephanas and his family, the firstfruits of Achaia.

The evidences that we have just been considering show that officials with authority directed the early Christian communities, especially in their liturgical gatherings. Were these officials priests? The question cannot be answered directly on the basis of the texts we

[32] I Tim. 3: 8 ff.
[33] I Tim. 3: 1.
[34] I Tim. 5: 18; II Tim. 2: 3 ff.
[35] Acts 11: 30; 14: 23; 21: 18; I Tim. 5: 1; I Pet. 5: 1, 4.
[36] Acts 20: 17, 28; Phil. 1: 1; I Tim. 3: 1 ff.; Tit. 1: 7, 9.

have thus far quoted.[37] Nor can it be answered by other texts that are often cited in support of the view that they were priests. Two passages are frequently referred to in this connection. One of these texts is taken from the First Epistle to the Corinthians (4: 1): "Let men account us as ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." The context shows that St. Paul, by "mysteries of God," means his own preaching activity. The other passage (Rom. 15: 16) says: ". . . the grace which hath been given me from God, that I should be a priest of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles, that I should sacrifice in the service of God's gospel, and that my offering of the Gentiles should be acceptable, being sanctified in the Holy Spirit." The word "priest" in this passage is evidently used in a wide sense of the term. Further, St. Paul himself in the context shows that he is using the terms "priest" and "sacrifice" to signify his Apostolic preaching. The words are taken from the Jewish terminology.

But we can establish indirectly from New Testament passages the existence of priests in the strict sense of liturgical personages, who were charged with the direction of the assemblies.[38]

In the minds of the early Christians the very word "apostle" may have been associated with the idea of priesthood. In the Jewish liturgy[39] we read: "The

[37] See translator's note on p. 384.

[38] The Epistle to the Hebrews makes priesthood and sacrifice correlative. Hence many New Testament texts usually quoted as proof of an official and distinct New Testament priesthood are not conclusive because they contain no reference to sacrifice.

[39] Kiddush 23b. The Kiddush was "an ancient Jewish ceremony to pro-

priests who sacrifice must be looked upon as ambassadors of God because they cannot be regarded as our ambassadors since we ourselves cannot offer sacrifice." The Epistle to the Hebrews emphasizes indeed the uniqueness of Christ's high-priesthood.[40] However, what Ecclesiasticus [41] says about the Jewish high-priesthood, the Christians might easily have applied to the Apostles. Since the Apostles had a close relationship with God, their prayers and blessings were esteemed as of especially great value. In the Jewish liturgy the blessing was a part of the daily sacrifice. It was given from the steps of the Temple court by the priests every morning and every evening to the people to whom they had just preached.

We do, in fact, find in the New Testament, great value attaching to the Apostles' prayers, blessings, and presence, even their very shadow.[42] Of particular significance is the value attributed to the laying on of hands by the Apostles.[43]

We now proceed to consider the evidence furnished by the Apocalypse. That the Apocalypse would be second only to the Epistle to the Hebrews in its testimony to the existence of a distinctly Christian priesthood, we might expect, since its predominant image is that of a solemn gathering for the worship of God. In fact, however, this testimony is scant and would scarcely be evi-

claim the holiness of the Sabbath or a festival, consisting of a benediction in prayer pronounced before the evening meal; usually over a glass of wine" (Webster's dictionary).

[40] Heb. 1: 3; 2: 11, 17; 4: 14.

[41] Ecclus. 45: 13 ff.; 50: 1–24.

[42] Acts 5: 15; 8: 15; 9: 40; 20: 36; 28: 8; Jas. 5: 14; cf. Heb. 7: 1 ff.

[43] Acts 8: 18.

dent without the aid of subsequent Christian tradition.

This much is certain: the communities to which the Apocalypse is addressed are presided over by responsible officials with definite rights and duties. But the Scripture itself does not say explicitly that they were priests. The description of the heavenly Jerusalem (chap. 21), with its walls on twelve foundation stones which are inscribed with the twelve names of the apostles of the Lamb, contains reminders of the Old Testament high-priesthood. God's throne, surrounded by the twenty-four ancients (4: 4), might call to mind the liturgical community under the direction of the bishop and the priests. But even passages like these do not settle the question whether the officials of the Christian communities were priests. The account in the Apocalypse is a description of a heavenly form of worship. Its details cannot be applied to the Church on earth, even though the images are taken from earthly forms of worship, especially from the Jewish liturgy. Furthermore, the Apocalypse is so insistent upon the general priesthood of all the faithful that it does not emphasize the idea of the priesthood in the strict sense. The twenty-four ancients can well be taken as standing for all Christians.

To give all these passages their full weight, we must add the texts which deal with the celebration of the Lord's Supper and those which deal with the necessary connection between sacrifice and priesthood (Epistle to the Hebrews). If to these we add the pre-eminent importance of the priesthood in the Old Testament and even in pagan worship, then the answer of the Apostolic fathers becomes authoritative. The officials who pre-

sided over the Christian assemblies were priests in the liturgical and hierarchical sense. The Apostolic fathers all insist on the inseparable union of sacrifice and priesthood.[44]

[44] Cf. *Didache*, XIV, 15; I Clement, 42–44 (esp. 44, no. 4) (*PG*, I, 296 ff.); Ignatius to Philad., 4 (*PG*, V, 700); to Smyr., 8 (*PG*, V, 714).

CHAPTER XXV

FUNDAMENTAL FORMS OF THE LITURGY

SCHOLARS speak generally of a twofold form in early Christian liturgy: community of the word and community of the table.

At least in the very beginning the usual practice observed this division. Christians kept the Jewish custom of a morning period of worship in the Temple, but celebrated the Lord's Supper in the evening. But the First Epistle to the Corinthians [1] shows that the two forms tended to merge into each other. We cannot indeed suppose that unbelievers [2] were present at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Hence we are justified in holding that the two services (of the word and of the table) were distinct in place and in time. Yet the distinction remains problematical. The events narrated in the fourteenth chapter might have taken place in connection with the celebration of the Lord's Supper or immediately afterward.

Let us now consider the early Christian practice of worship in the Temple and in private houses.[3] The

[1] Chaps. 10, 11, 14.
[2] I Cor. 14: 23.
[3] Cf. Acts 2: 46.

Christian worship in the Temple consisted of prayer and instruction, and probably also the offering of sacrificial gifts (e. g., almsgiving and the performance of Nazarite vows). Divine worship in private houses was a peculiarly Christian practice. It centered in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Either before or after this celebration the Christians went to the Temple for the evening sacrifice.[4]

Both of these occasions had in common the preaching by the Apostles, which facilitated the Christians' subsequent withdrawal from the Temple services. This separation probably took place gradually some time after the writing of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The preaching in the Temple had in view the winning of converts; the preaching at the domestic services had rather the form of exhortation and aimed at deepening and expanding the contents of Christian belief. Prominent in the Temple preaching is the element held both by Jews and by Christians, namely, what they inherited from the patriarchs. In the domestic worship the preaching concerned what was specifically Christian. The Temple worship and the domestic had in common preaching and prayer. But specifically Christian were baptism and the Lord's Supper.[5]

The converts from Judaism, as we have already noted, for a long time retained Jewish liturgical practices. Hence they preserved the Sabbath as the day for

[4] Acts 3: 1.

[5] For evidence of the close connection between baptism and the Eucharist, see *Didache*, IX, 5, and Justin, *I Apol.*, 66 (*PG*, VI, 428).

liturgical assemblies. Hence also they attended the morning and evening sacrifices in the Temple.

The need of further development was brought home to the converts from Judaism by the success of the Christian missions among the pagans, and especially by St. Paul's defense of Christianity against Judaizing influences. These controversies, as we might expect, concerned mostly questions of liturgical observance. As instances, we may note the following: the Apostles' decree regarding observance of Jewish prescriptions, the dispute between Peter and Paul in Antioch, the discussion about circumcision and Sabbath observance, St. Paul's concessions in regard to frequenting the Temple and in the matter of the Nazarite vows.

When did the Church in Judea give up its peculiar position? We must not assign too early a date. "Converts from Judaism preserved for long decades a union between their belief in Jesus as the Messias and the observance of the Mosaic Law. This attitude is hard for us to understand, but is a necessary consequence of Jewish history." [6] We may well assign the destruction of the Temple as the period when the primitive Christian community at Jerusalem lost "its importance as a factor in the formation and development of the Church, and this dominant position was taken by the Church among the Gentiles." [7]

But before this change the Church in Jerusalem had

[6] Albert Ehrhard, *Das Christentum im römischen Reiche bis Konstantin*, 1911, p. 11.

[7] See preceding note.

saved for Christianity what was most valuable in the Jewish liturgy. This heritage served to preserve the Gentile communities from the danger of pagan excesses.

St. Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, gives us a vivid account of these excesses. They are not owing to

Jewish doctrine and Jewish mentality. The general character of these excesses is a tendency to disorderliness,[8] even to indulgence in sensual enjoyments,[9] and also to the use of the gifts of the Spirit in an excessively emotional manner. The community is characterized by individualism, presumption, partizanship. St. Paul's account gives us a picture of a community in a state of agitation, which the Apostle is endeavoring to bring to a state of tranquillity and order. Particularly when he speaks of the abuses connected with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, we have the impression that a solemn religious function is in danger of degenerating to a form of social entertainment. . . .

The community at Corinth manifests the signs of an unhealthy religious activity. This is shown by their rivalries in exercising the gifts of the spirit, their quarrels for preeminence, the exaggerated importance attached to the gift of tongues, and the unregulated eagerness in the exercise of the gift of prophecy. . . . The community before us is a Gentile Christian community, attended by all the dangers that usually accompany new movements. On the one hand, religious excesses must be restrained to keep the community free from these pagan customs. On the other hand, the fanaticism and ecstasies of the pagan mystery cults must be kept from entering. We may rightly suppose that among the faulty reasons which led pagans in the first place to embrace Christianity was an expectation of find-

[8] I Cor. 14: 39.
[9] I Cor. 11: 21.

ing in the new religion the ecstatic thrills which they had experienced in pagan Oriental cults.[10]

St. Paul, in his condemnation of these abuses, incidentally furnishes us with extensive information about the Christian liturgy in Gentile communities. The four main parts are prayer, reading of Scripture, preaching, and the celebration of the sacred meal. These are likewise parts of the Christian liturgy at Jerusalem. Both in Jerusalem and in Corinth these elements are combined with the singing of psalms and hymns.

A striking trait of the liturgy at Corinth is their dramatic way of celebrating the life and death of their Lord and Savior Jesus. The heavenly "King of the universe," appearing in the circle of His own people, to whom He is both priest and food, is an idea that is found magnificently developed in the later Christian Oriental liturgy. But the outlines of this idea can be found in the New Testament, especially in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.[11] The dramatic element in this idea is based, not upon the Jewish liturgy, but rather upon the pagan mystery cults.

Thus we may speak of two sources in the formation of the Christian liturgy. These sources gradually united. The specific Christian element that was common to both, combining the element of instruction and the sacred meal, also united the two sources, Jewish and Gentile, into a single form of Christian worship. The symbol of this union was the observance of Sunday

10 Karl Weizsäcker, "Die Versammlung der ältesten Christengemeinden" in *Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie,* XXI (1876), 383 f.

11 Chaps. 10, 11, 14; cf. Rom. 5: 1 ff.; 16: 25–27; Col. 1: 24 ff.; 2: 12.

instead of the Sabbath. The union took place in the Gentile Christian communities, which acquired the dominant position enjoyed by the Church in Jerusalem before the destruction of the Temple.

CHAPTER XXVI

LANGUAGE OF THE LITURGY

THE principle which St. Paul uses in correcting the abuses in the Church at Corinth is that of constructive upbuilding. Whatever is spoken in the assembly must contribute to the building up of the faithful. For instance, prophecy or the gift of tongues can be an element in this work only if it has a form intelligible to all. The exercise of the spiritual gifts, if it is of advantage only to the speaker, has no importance for the liturgy. This view holds true even if the gift is of high order, as was, for instance, St. Paul's gift of tongues.

The principle here set forth by St. Paul can be illustrated elsewhere in the New Testament. We have already noted that in many passages of the New Testament writings we find doctrine clearly formulated, in phrases often repeated. Further, we have seen that the practice of spontaneous praying gradually gave way to a set form often influenced by Jewish forms of prayer. This prevalence of set formulas is to be observed especially in ejaculatory phrases. We note, for example, the frequent ejaculation, "Jesus is Lord." In I Cor. 12: 3, this phrase is used as a criterion in distinguishing genu-

ine prophecy from false. That the form is invariable is shown by the following passages: I Cor. 12: 3; Rom. 10: 9; Phil. 2: 11.

These brief formulas of faith in Jesus are the first evidences we find of the Christians' new liturgical language. These expressions, originating in spontaneous longing for the coming of the Lord, gradually assumed a set and determined form. "Maranatha" [1] is an illustration of such spontaneous expressions. Likewise the words "Come, Lord Jesus," at the end of the Apocalypse. But in this latter instance we are justified in thinking that the phrase was used also in the liturgy.[2] If this is true, then we may the more securely believe that certain doctrinal formulas, found in the New Testament, had their origin in the liturgy.

Let us consider some examples. "According to the flesh, according to the spirit"; [3] the contrast between humiliation and glorification, between suffering and resurrection; [4] "God and Christ"; [5] Trinitarian formulas.[6]

We must notice that these formulas sometimes mention all three Persons of the Trinity, sometimes only two or one. "The one formula appears as readily as the other. At times we have 'God and Spirit,' again 'God and Lord,' 'Lord and Spirit.' Because of the Trinitarian controversies that later arose, the modern reader takes

[1] I Cor. 16: 22.
[2] Apoc. 22: 17.
[3] Rom. 1: 4; cf. Rom. 9: 5; I Tim. 3: 16; I Pet. 3: 18.
[4] I Cor., chap. 15; Phil. 2: 5 ff.; I Pet. 3: 18, 22.
[5] I Cor. 8: 6; cf. I Tim. 6: 13; II Tim. 4: 1.
[6] Matt. 28: 19; I Cor. 12: 4 ff.; II Cor. 13: 13.

particular notice of the passages in which the three divine Persons are mentioned. The sacred writer is not preoccupied with always mentioning all three Persons of the Trinity. Sometimes he does so,[7] but again, under similar literary circumstances, he mentions only one or two.

Our opinion is that these expressions had already become liturgical formulas. Various reasons prompt this view. 1. The formulas are stated with a certain solemnity. 2. Similar three-membered formulas occur elsewhere in the New Testament.[8] 3. They could not have been introduced from non-Christian sources. 4. A threefold appellation of God was familiar to the Jewish liturgy.[9]

We have already spoken of the doxologies. Here a brief word will suffice. They reveal clearly the influence of the Old Testament liturgy on that of the New Testament. Their liturgical character appears in the following passages: Rom. 1: 25; 9: 5; Gal. 1: 3–5; Eph. 3: 20 f.; Phil. 4: 20; I Tim. 1: 17; II Tim. 4: 18; I Pet. 3: 18; 4: 11; 5: 11. In these passages we often find the Old Testament formula "forever and ever, amen." In the New Testament the doxologies are addressed either simply to God or to our glorified Lord or to both. The doxologies illustrate the extent to which liturgical phrases have influenced the formulation of doctrine.

The use of "amen" is frequent in the New Testa-

[7] I Cor. 12: 4; II Cor. 13: 13.
[8] I Tim. 5: 21; II Tim. 4: 1; Apoc. 1: 8, 18; 4: 8.
[9] Josue 22: 22 (see the Hebrew); Ps. 49: 1; Is. 6: 3.

ment. From I Cor. 14: 16 [10] we learn that it concluded all prayers. From the Old Testament the word "amen" entered the New Testament unchanged, where it occurs about fifty times. It is used in four different ways: as an adverb, as a formula of adjuration, as ejaculatory prayer, and as a substantive.[11] The use of "amen" gives evidence of the influence of the liturgy in establishing literary usage.[12]

We may note other instances of the influence which the liturgical language exercised upon the New Testament writings. "I am sending thee to open their eyes, that they should turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, thus to receive forgiveness of their sins and a portion with those sanctified by faith in Me." [13] The reader may likewise note the instances in Heb. 1: 3 f. The word "sacrifice" and "service" frequently recur.[14] Christians are often called a "temple." [15]

Even in connection with Christians' individual lives, liturgical terms are used. We have already made considerable mention of the use of the term "building up." St. Paul speaks of his own life as a sacrifice.[16] In passages like these the influence of the Jewish liturgy is predominant. But we have already noted the influence

[10] Cf. Apoc. 5: 14; 7: 12.

[11] I Cor. 14: 16; II Cor. 1: 20; Apoc. 3: 14.

[12] Cf. Paul's inimitable word; that Christ is the "Amen" to all the promises of God (II Cor. 1: 20).

[13] Acts 26: 18.

[14] Rom. 12: 1; Phil. 2: 17; 4: 18; II Tim. 4: 6; Heb. 13: 15; Jas. 1: 27; I Pet. 2: 5.

[15] I Cor. 3: 16; II Cor. 6: 16; Eph. 2: 20; Heb. 3: 6.

[16] Rom. 15: 16; II Tim. 4: 6; cf. Ex. 30: 10.

of the Hellenistic mysteries, particularly in the conception that the worshiper's life must be an imitation of the divinity. In the New Testament these expressions possess a deeper ethical and spiritual significance which exerted a real influence in Christian life and literature.

Like the "amen," the "alleluia" also came to the Christians from the Jewish liturgy. The expression "Thanks be to God," however, comes from Christian sources.[17] It is but one example of frequently repeated prayers of praise and thanksgiving. Echoes of such prayers are heard everywhere in St. Paul and in the Apocalypse. "They resemble fixed liturgical formulas." [18] All apocalyptical literature calls for such solemn style. This quality in the Christian Apocalypse is a result of Christian liturgical influence.

Students of literature are familiar with the practice of reporting speeches, not in the precise words in which they were delivered, but with literary revision. Prayers revised in this fashion are to be found in the Old Testament.[19] In the New Testament two instances need to be considered. The prayer of the Apostles [20] and the high priestly prayer of Christ.[21] In the latter, two features might lead a reader to regard it as a literary embellishment, namely, the harmony of its literary style with that of the preceding context; further, the Evangelist's evident mindfulness of his readers.

In apocryphal literature we find such passages. In

[17] E. g., Rom. 6: 17; I Cor. 15: 57: II Cor. 2: 14; 8: 16; 9: 15.
[18] Baumstark, *Die Messe im Morgenland*, 1921, p. 18.
[19] Tob. 3: 13 ff.; Judith 9: 16; Dan. 9: 4 ff.; I Mach. 4: 30 ff.
[20] Acts 4: 24 ff.
[21] John, chap. 17.

what sense can they be found in the New Testament? Our Lord laid emphasis upon the reverence which belongs to prayer. Owing to the influence of His example and doctrine, the New Testament writers, in recording prayers that were said, would not have altered their wording for the sake of literary form. Hence, when these passages possess literary loftiness, we may conclude that they were written under the influence of the liturgy.

Ancient literature, when it dealt with law or religion, assumed an elevated style. This quality also marked the Christian writings, which were moral and religious. Further, all ancient literature was addressed to the ear rather than to the eye.[22] The Christian writings were intended for public reading in liturgical assemblies.

> The language of the New Testament mirrors forth the hopes and fears of the early Christians . . . their triumph over the world and over their enemies. These emotions are consecrated by pure love of God and neighbor and are animated by the spirit of Christ. Our Lord's parables and the fulness of meaning which the early Christians gave to the word "agape" show the power of early Christian forms of expression. This living language produced the earliest Christian writings. These writings, when they appeared in the liturgy, assumed a fitting solemnity of tone. Four qualities give to the New Testament its incomparable sublimity: the lofty prayerfulness, hope of salvation from the risen Lord, the consciousness of divine election, the blessed expectation of the Lord's coming. Sometimes we have in the New Testament set formulas of tradition so expressed that they echo the living language of the liturgy.[23]

[22] Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, 1882, p. 206.

[23] R. Schütz in *Zeitschrift für neut. Wissenschaft*, XXI (1922), 161–84.

The language of the liturgy was of far-reaching importance for Christian life and literature. Its advantage outweighed whatever restraint it placed upon spontaneous prayer. It also prevented an excessive and erratic development of personal enthusiasm. The fact that liturgical language became fixed in definite forms made the enthusiasm of individuals serve the upbuilding of the community. The *Dominus vobiscum* still retains the significance and fulness of meaning which it had for the early Christians. Next to Christ Himself, St. Paul was the most outstanding influence in the formation of the Christian liturgy. This influence of St. Paul may be summarized in the two ideas: the upbuilding of the Christian community and the value of charity as the heart and soul of that undertaking. These two ideas include not only Christian life imbued with the spirit of Jesus, but also the development of a characteristic Christian liturgy.

INDEX

Abba, origin of the term, 205 ff.
Abel, blood of, 186
Activity and prayer, 27
Accuracy, kinds of, 22
Acts, liturgy in, 159 ff.
Adoptive sonship and prayer, 231 f.
Agabus, urging Paul, 211
Alexandrian school: conceptions, 176 f.; philosophy, 119
Alleluia, origin of, 401
Altar: meaning of, in Heb. 13: 10, 186 f., 311; participation in, 312 f.
Amen, ways of using, 399 f.
Analogy, body and members, 269
Ananias and Saphira, 197
Andrew in the Temple, 23
"Angels" in I Cor. 11: 10, 360
Anna, model in worship, 111 f.
Anthologies, in Greek by Jews, 116
Antioch: dispute in, 110 f.; synagogue at, 107
Apocalypse, liturgical style of, 401
Apollo: by whom instructed, 356 f.; and Scripture, 245
Apologists, Eucharistic sacrifice in, 154
Apostles, prophecies in life of, 200
Apostolic fathers, authority of, 389 f.
Aramaic, by whom spoken, 21
Areopagus: Paul on, 127; themes in sermon on, 255
Aristeas, letter of, 52
Assembly
  confusion in, 278 f.
  garments worn in, 376.
Assembly (*continued*)
  morning and evening, 347
  in the name of Jesus, 218
  places of, 336 ff.
  posture in, 376 f.
  prayer in, 202
  in private houses, 334 ff.
Astonishment of hearers, 64 f.
Athens, synagogue at, 107
Atonement, how attained, 318 ff.
Augustine on survival of gifts, 279 f.
Authority: from the Apostles, 284 f.; of Jesus' teaching, 66

Banquet, in Old Testament books, 292
Beelzebub, in miracles, 269
Bending knee in liturgy, 168
Beneficence and thanksgiving, 236 f.
Beroea, synagogue at, 107
Blessing at meals: in Jewish usage, 295; in shipwreck, 296 f.; synonyms of, 296
Blood: at Last Supper, 319; meaning of, 185, 317 f.
Blood of Christ: power of, 320 f.; twofold effect of, 319 f.
Body, value of, 148
Bread, breaking of
  in assembly, 291
  at Emmaus, 298
  meaning of, 297 f.
  origin of term, 298
  in private houses, 290 f.
  and sacred banquet, 290 ff.
  at Troas, 297

Bread, sharing of, 294 ff.

Calling on name, meaning of expression, 219 ff.
Canticles: frequency of, 282 f.; in the Gospels, 282 f.
Capharnaum, synagogue in, 63, 107
Cenchrae, house of assembly in, 337
Charismata: in prayer, 202; in rulers, 281 f.
Charity: enduring character of, 372; superiority of, 60, 269; and unity, 382; in upbuilding, 370 f.
Childlike prayer of Jesus, 12 f.: and the Our Father, 40
Chosen people, title applied to, 81
Christ
  blood of, 191
  and the Church, 152
  death of, 162
  duration of, 183 f., 189
  and external worship, 183
  finality of, 155 f., 165
  gift of, 185
  in heaven, 184 f.
  in, through, and with, 164 f.
  and the Law, 145
  and liturgy, 403
  office of, 165
  and paschal lamb, 321 f.
  in sacrifice, 183
  use of name, 135
Christian faith, liturgy and, 133 ff.
Christian feasts, how old, 343 f.
Christian liturgy: genesis of, 194 ff.; and Jesus, 79 ff.; sources of, 395
Christian teachers, 127 f.
Christian worship, place of, 391 f.
Christianity
  growth of, 336 f.
  Hellenism and, 136
  Judaism and, 106 f.
  how expressed, 137 f.
  popular ideas and, 130
  propagation of, 115
  qualities of, 139
  spirit of, 287
Christians
  attitude to Jews, 108
  attitude to mankind, 134 ff.
  from what class, 103 f.
  definition of, 142
  in God's house, 309 ff.
  hours of prayer among, 341
  and priesthood, 134, 155 f.
  and the Spirit, 267
  and the supernatural, 160 f.
  symbol of, 155 f.
  types of, 123
Christology, early, 164 f., 167 ff.
Colossae, house of assembly in, 337
Commandments, kinds of, 70 f.
Commemoration in Passover meal, 324
Community, two kinds of, 391 ff.
Community prayer: and community, 37 ff.; how old, 37; influence of, 36; sources of, 43
Confidence in Apostles, 200
Conjuring in pagan prayer, 90
Contents of liturgical prayer, 229 ff.
Contrasts
  charismatic and moral, 277 f.
  charity and charismata, 381 f.
  Christianity and civilization, 137 ff.
  Christians and Essenes, 104
  cursing and blessing, 233 f.
  ethical and ecstatic, 277
  gifts and charity, 372
  gnosis and love, 371 f.
  God and the world, 138
  Hellenism and Paul, 230 f.
  holy of holies and God's throne, 179 f.
  idiotes and unbeliever, 351
  inward and outward, 368
  Jesus and synagogue, 102 f.
  Jewish prayer and Christian, 200
  liturgy and individualism, 403
  Lord's day and day of the Lord, 345
  order and enthusiasm, 205
  priesthood and faith, 190

Contrasts (*continued*)
prophecy and gift of tongues, 269 f.
prophecy and oral instruction, 263
prophets and synagogue, 102 f.
public and private, 238
religion and liturgy, 256
Sabbath and Sunday, 347 f.
in sayings of Jesus, 55 f.
standards and warnings, 360
tabernacle and altar, 188
Temple and synagogue, 103 f.
within and without, 349 ff.
Conversion, meaning of, 153
Converts: and symbols, 159; and Old Testament, 245
Corinth: abuse in church at, 360; idol-offerings in, 125; Stephanas, 337; synagogue at, 107
Covenant: and blood, 317 f.; and communion table, 317 f.
Creeds, origin of, 166
Cross: anguish on, 18 ff.; prayer on, 15 ff.; where, 188
Crucifixion, in Paul's preaching, 256
Cry of jubilation (Luke 10: 21 f.), genuineness of, 9 note 12
Culture, Jewish, 116
Cup in Jewish paschal meal, 315
Customs in life of Jesus, 36

Daily prayer, object of, 229 f.
Damascus, synagogue at, 107, 334
Day of the Lord, how considered, 312
Days, how distinguished, 342
Death, prayer in, 16
Decorum and ecstasy, 279
Defilement, source of, 75 f.
Demeanor of participants, 368 ff.
Developments among Gentile Christians, 123
Devotion, source of, 46
Diatheke, meanings of, 180
Diaspora, influence of, 115
Disciples: role of, 79; in Temple, 57 f.
Doctrine, wrong development of, 53
Doxologies: in liturgy, 235 f., 399; origin of, 225 f.
Dramatic song; *see* Theios choros
Duchesne on Christian worship, 106

Eating and drinking, kinds of, 327 ff.
Ejaculations in liturgy, 377 f., 397 f.
Ekklesia
duration of, 138 f.
and liturgy, 338 f.
meaning of, 135 f.
origin of, 338 f.
and synagogue, 135
Elymas and Paul, 277 f.
Emmaus, breaking of bread at, 298
Emperor, worship of, 129 f.
Enthusiasm: Christian, 283 f.; in liturgy, 403
Ephesus: house of assembly in, 337; synagogue at, 107
Epictetus, why regarded as Christian, 128
Epiousios, in the Our Father, 43
Epistle: to the Hebrews, 176 ff.; and oral instruction, 257 f.; of St. Paul, 142 ff.; where read, 248 ff.
Equality: in Christ, 352 f.; liturgical, 355 ff.; principle of, 352 f.
Eschatology: and charity, 157; and liturgy, 136 and note 8
Essenes, relation to Temple, 104 f.
Ethnology and prayer, 3
Evodia praised, 357
Exaggeration in exalting Christ's divinity, 13 note
Excesses among Gentile converts, 393 ff.
Excommunication: Jewish and Christian, 353 f.; meaning, 353 f.
Exegesis, rabbinical, 177, 359
Eyes to heaven in prayer, 28

Farewell discourse, and liturgy, 214
Fasting: in Jesus' teaching, 72 f.; in relation to God, 108; in relation to man, 108
Father
  epithets of, 235 f.
  in high-priestly prayer, 32
  and perfection, 71
  position of word, 12
  prayer to the, 205 ff.
  use of, 80 ff., 208
  will of, 38
Fear of demons, prevalence of, 10
Fellowship: in New Testament, 195; in body and blood, 317 ff.
Filial affection in Jesus, 15 f.
Following of Christ, meaning of, 375, 378
Forgiveness: and Christianity, 16; prayer for, 87 f.
Formalism in Pharisees, 45
Formulas: liturgical, 235 f., 391 f., 399; trinitarian, 398 f.
Fourth Gospel, character of, 147
Freedom: and Church law, 368 f.; in expression, 380; and love, 372; and order, 239
Friendship of Jesus, 25
Fringes among Christians, 376 f.

Garb of Christians, 127 f.
Genesis of Christian liturgy, 194 ff.
Gesture in prayer, 28
Gethsemane, Jesus in, 12 ff.
Gifts
  importance of, 382 f.
  perishableness of, 372
  of prophecy, 263 ff.
  regulation of, 363
  subordination of, 238 f.
  survival of, 279 f.
  of tongues, 273 ff.
Glorification: frequency of term, 234 f.; in high-priestly prayer, 30; prayer for, 23 ff.
Glorified Lord, prayer to, 219 ff.
Glossa, three meanings, 273 ff.
Gnostics and upbuilding, 371 f.
God
  fatherhood of, 80 ff., 91
  kingdom of, 11, 210
  title of, 81
  great supper of, 311
  will of, 11, 210 f.
Gods, pagan, 310 f.
Gospel: and Law, 71; origin of, 21 f.; and reconciliation, 166 f.
Greek language: among Jews, 117; in liturgy, 116 f.
Greeks and Jesus, 23
Gregorian chant, *jubilus*, 280

Haftorah, meaning of, 241 f.
"Hallow," meaning of, 209
Hebrews, Epistle to
  and Apocalypse, 184
  author and readers, 189
  characteristics of, 177 ff.
  earthly events in, 192
  language of, 182
  nature of, 180
  purpose and occasion of, 180 f.
  St. John and, 191
  and St. Paul, 176 f.
Hellenism: and Judaism, 116; limited influence of, 131 f.
Hellenistic Christians, term clarified, 123
Hellenistic culture, influence of, 126
Helpers, enumeration of, 385 f.
Hem, meaning of, 92 f.
Herod Antipas and Jesus, 265
High priest, power of, 176
High-priestly prayer
  and the Church, 31 f.
  harmony and rhythm of, 31
  invocation in, 32
  length of, 31
  quality of, 32 f.
  spirituality of, 31
  spontaneity of, 31
  tone of, 31
  and unity, 31
Holocaust in sacrifice of Jesus, 173
Holy kiss in the liturgy, 375 f.
Hospitality and Christ, 373 f.

Host, flesh and blood of, 312
Household of God, members of, 340
Human element in prayer of Jesus, 13
Hymns: singing of, 281 ff.; and the synagogue, 284 f.

Iconium, synagogue at, 107
Idiotae, meaning of, 350 note 7, 351
Idiotes, special meaning of, 351
Idolater, mind of, 310 f.
Idol-offerings: eating of, 124 ff.; meaning of, 310 f.
Imposition of hands, meaning of, 160 f.
Innate knowledge of Jesus, 67 f.
Intelligibility in manifestations, 380 f.
Invocation of Christ, 220
Israel: and Christianity, 134; in relation to God, 82

Jahve, how pictured, 312 f.
James: and the liturgy, 158; and Paul, 62; on pure worship, 156 f.
Jeremias: prayers of, 86 f.; prophecy of, 320
Jesus
  anguish of, 18 ff., 89
  on the cross, 15 ff.
  divinity of, 131 note, 67 f., 134, 163 ff., 212 ff., 222 f.
  filial affection of, 15 f.
  garb of, 92
  in Gethsemane, 12 ff.
  at grave of Lazarus, 26 ff.
  humanity of, 13
  loyalty of, 18
  in relation to Old Testament, 69, 171 f., 182
  resignation of, 17 ff.
  sacrifice of, 173
  temptation of, 177
Jesus, prayers of
  characteristics of, 9 f., 21, 34 f., 89
  fruit of, 14
  the high-priestly prayer, 29 ff.
  outward situation of, 22
Jesus, prayers of (*continued*)
  and the psalms, 19 f.
  refrain of, 14
  at table, 36
  with whom, 36
Jesus, teaching of
  about fasting, 72 f.
  places of, 57 f.
  about prayer, 4, 34 ff.
  about the Sabbath, 73 ff.
  style of, 55 f.
  supremacy of, 64 ff.
Jesus' attitude toward
  His disciples, 33, 79
  the Father, 85
  formalism, 45
  Jewish piety, 55 ff.
  Jews and pagans, 105 f.
  the Law, 68 ff.
  the Law and liturgy, 61
  the liturgy, 3, 79 ff., 169
  mankind, 88, 163 f.
  Pharisees, 76 ff.
  priests and scribes, 61, 64 f.
  public prayer, 8 ff.
  Sadducees and Pharisees, 61
  the Samaritan woman, 93 ff., 119
  the scribes, 61
  Scripture, 65 ff.
  the synagogue, 63 ff.
  the temple, 56 ff.
  tradition, 324 f.
Jewish Christianity, separation from Temple, 58
Jewish courts: and Christians, 108; viewpoint of, 62
Jewish exegesis, condemnation of, 67
Jewish feasts, Christian attitude toward, 343 f.
Jewish influences: affecting the primitive liturgy, 96 ff.; on prayer, 237; how shown, 114; summary, 113
Jewish liturgy
  clean and unclean in, 146
  Jesus' attitude toward, 55 ff.
  participation in, 91

Jewish liturgy (*continued*)
sacred song in, 281 f.
separation from, 347 f.
in the synagogue, 48 ff.
in the Temple, 45 ff.
Joel and Paul, 221 f.
John, Gospel of: artistry of, 23 note 58; and Jesus' prayers, 21 ff.; and the liturgy, 159, 329; and the Synoptics, 21
John the Baptist: austerity of, 109; prayer of, 41
Joy: in relation to prayer, 14; in New Testament song, 285 f.
Jubilus in Gregorian chant, 280
Judaism
failure of, 116
influence of Hellenism, 116
as mediator, 115
in relation to Temple, 104
syncretistic, 119 f.
Jude, prayer in the Holy Ghost, 157
Justin on oral instruction, 262

Key of knowledge, by whom possessed, 68 ff.
King, as liturgical title, 80 ff.

Lamb: marriage supper of, 311; paschal, 171 f.
Language: and liturgy, 219, 397 ff.; meaning of, 374
Laodicea, house of assembly in, 337
Last Supper
character of, 323 f.
and covenant of blood, 307
day of, 322 ff.
four accounts of, 303
and Jewish paschal meal, 323
in relation to Old Testament, 317
Law
attitude toward the, 54
bondage to the, 50
ceremonial, 52
despair of fulfilling the, 52
duration of the, 71 ff.
and Gospel, 71
relation of Jesus to the, 68 ff.
Law (*continued*)
meaning of the, 70 ff.
and Paul, 108
permanence of the, 70 ff.
in pseudoepigraphic books, 51 ff.
qualities of, 53
Lazarus, prayer at grave of, 25
Legality and loyalty, 71
Leitourgein, meaning of, 159 f.
Levitical priesthood, deficiencies of, 178
Life and prayer, 201 f.
Literary forms, value of, 374 f.
Literature and public reading, 402 f.
Literatures: Judaeo-Hellenistic, 116; New Testament vs. Graeco-Roman, 127
Liturgical language, 397 ff.
dramatic, 129, 395
Greek, 116
influence on style, 400 f.
and literary revision, 402
and moral life, 161
name of God in, 80 ff.
Liturgy
beginnings of, 153, 219
contents of, 229 ff.
in Eastern Churches, 345
meaning of, 374
participation in, 349 ff.
parts of, 126, 391 ff.
places where celebrated, 330 ff.
regulation of, 379 ff.
and sacrifice, 172, 185 f.
sources of, 56: Christian thought, 175; heaven, 160 f.; Holy Spirit, 147 ff.; Jesus, 3 ff., 33 f.
spirit of, 161, 375
times when celebrated, 340 ff.
Liturgy in the New Testament, 142 ff.
Acts, 159 ff.
Epistle to the Hebrews, 176 ff.
St. James, 158
St. John, 159, 214 f.
St. Paul, 142 ff.
St. Peter, 155 ff.
Liturgy in the Old Testament, 181 f.

Logikos (Rom. 12: 1), meaning of, 148
Logos, in pagan world, 127
"Lord," how used, 211, 225
Lord's body and blood, fellowship in, 317 ff.
Lord's cup: fellowship in, 313; meaning of, 314 f.
Lord's Supper
  abuses in, 300 ff.
  acts detailed, 305
  connotations of, 307
  and John, 328 f.
  meaning of, 300 ff.
  nature of, 301
  origin of, 302 f.
  and Paul, 302 f.
  persons excluded from, 350 f.
  posture of participants in, 377
  and sacrifice, 319 ff.
  and special meeting places, 336
  in Synoptics, 306 ff.
  time of celebration, 391
  for whom intended, 300 ff.
Lord's Table, Christian view of, 313 ff.
Love: for disciples, 33; and freedom, 372; and perfection, 373 f.; and the Sabbath, 74 f.
Loyalty: of Jesus, 18; and legality, 71
Luke on Jesus at prayer, 10, 41, 79
Lyric passages in Paul and Apocalypse, 288 f.

Magnificat, spirit of, 286
Manifestations of the Spirit, 380
Manna: and Messias, 292 f.; spirituality of, 152
Maranatha: meaning of, 209 f., 222 f.; origin of, 222 f.
Meal in common: in Acts, 293 f.; in John, 327 ff.; symbolism of, 294 f.
Meal, in general, 296 f., 313
Mediation: of Christ, 165, 383; how expressed, 217 f.; by whom exercised, 217, 383
Melchisedech: and Abraham, 178; and Christ, 177
Messias: and God's victory, 11; and manna, 292 f.
Midrash on Numbers 21: 17 f., 152
Miletus, Paul's prayer at, 201
Mithraism, how propagated, 115
Month, divisions of, 341 f.
Moses: and Christ, 133 f., 180; position of, 69; and prophecy, 101
Mount Garizim and the Temple, 94 f.
Mount of Olives, Jesus on, 79
Müller (Max) on pre-eminence of psalms, 282
Mutual forgiveness and prayer, 39
Mysteries: Christian and non-Christian, 215 f.; Graeco-Roman, 121 f.

Name of God in liturgy, 80 ff.
Name of Jesus, prayer in the, 212 ff.
Nazareth, synagogue in, 63 f., 107
Nazarite vow, performance of, 111, 330 f.
New Covenant foretold, 100
New Testament books: and liturgy, 142 ff.; where read, 247 ff.
Nicodemus, ignorance of, 159

Odes of Solomon, 124
Oikia and derivatives, 339 f.
Old Testament: in Christian liturgy, 246 ff.; Christians' knowledge of, 243 f.; inspiration of, 246 f.; prophesying Christ, 244 ff.
Oral instruction
  charismatic, 254
  in Christian liturgy, 252 ff.
  classes of hearers, 258
  in common, 251 ff.
  echoes of, 257 f.
  elements of, 253 ff
  exhortative, 254
  expressions for, 252 ff.

Pagan houses, Christians in, 125
Pagan ideas, persistence of, 126

Pagan influences: mediated by Judaism, 115; on primitive liturgy, 115 ff.
Pagan worship, splendor of, 138 f.
Paganism: deficiency of, 236; the overcoming of, 166
Pagans in the Temple, 24
Pais tou Theou: in Acts, 168 f.; in Hebrews, 182
Parables: child asking bread, 83; friend at midnight, 83; importunate widow, 83; vine and branches, 164
Parables, teaching on prayer, 84
Paradosis; see Tradition
Parallels: old canticles and new, 283; life and liturgy, 403; prophecy and private prayer, 272 f.
Parenthesis to public reader, 247
Parents of Jesus, liturgical zeal of, 112
Participants: demeanor of, 368 ff.; the faithful, 349 ff.; women, 355 ff.
Participation, qualities of, 283 f., 379 f.
Parousia and the Our Father, 209 f.; and liturgical development, 153 f.
Patrons, importance of, 386
Paul
  development of, 143: and liturgical beginnings, 153; past and present in, 146 f.; power of tradition in, 142 f.
  on fulness of time, 133
  interpreting Joel, 221 f.
  and Nazarite vow, 111
  and oral instruction, 260 f.
  and table prayers, 296 f.
Paul, personality of
  charity and severity of, 354 f.
  greatness of, 278 f.
  Hellenistic element in, 122
  human qualities of, 257
  inner freedom of, 143
  manysidedness of, 144
  mysticism of, 371 f.
Paul, personality of (*continued*)
  originality of, 140
  straightforwardness of, 146 f.
Paul's relation to
  apologists, 154
  Christian liturgy, 142 ff.
  Christians, 232 f.
  fellow workers, 380 f.
  Fourth Gospel, 147
  James, 62
  Jesus, 18 note, 227, 372 f.
  Jewish liturgy, 118, 165 f.
  the Law, 245 f.
  mankind, 232 f.
  religious aristocracy, 381
  synagogue, 107
  women, 356 f.
People in Old Testament, 100
Perseverance and Jesus' prayer, 14
Peter
  fellow presbyters, 381
  James, 62
  the liturgy, 155 ff.
  oral instruction, 260
  prayers for, 201
  on reading Paul, 249
  spiritual worship, 155 f.
  women's vocation, 364
Pharisees: condemned, 76 f.; and fasting, 108; formalism, 45; representing synagogue and the Law, 54
Philip in the Temple, 23
Philippi, synagogue at, 107
Philo: Jewish philosophy, 120 f.; importance of preaching, 120 f.; syncretism, 121
Phoebe, praise of, 356
Piety: Jewish, 45 f.; meaning of, 376
Places, liturgical, 330 ff.
Pliny on Christian hymns, 226 f.
Pneuma, meaning of, 159
Poor, collections for the, 196
Popular ideas interpreting Christianity, 130
Popular philosophy too little known, 128 f.

Posture in liturgical assemblies, 376 f.
"Power," in I Cor. 11: 10, 360
Practice of prayer, Jesus', 6 ff.
Practices in common: oral instruction, 251 ff.; prayer, 195 ff.; Scripture reading, 241 ff.
Praise and thanks in table prayers, 35 f.
Prayer
  accompaniments of, 237
  and activity, 27
  always and everywhere, 93
  and charisma, 202
  childlike, 217
  in common, 36 ff., 195 ff.
  dangers surrounding, 239 f.
  formulas of, 20, 41
  genuine and counterfeit, 84
  and gesture, 28
  kinds of, 203 f.
  and liturgy, 174 f.
  mediation in, 227 f.
  and mutual forgiveness, 39
  in the name of Jesus, 38, 212 ff.
  objects of, 37, 200
  origin of, 158 f., 235
  power of, 7, 214 f.
  in Sermon on the Mount, 8
  sincerity, 27
  and spirit, 158 f.
  spontaneous, 80, 397
  and temptation, 7
  times of, 204
  in the two Testaments, 84 f.
  unbroken, 397 f.
  and union with God's will, 84
  universality of, 3
  by whom said, 201, 204 f.
  for whom, 203
  to whom directed, 168, 205 ff., 219 ff.
  and worship, 157 ff.
Prayer of Jesus
  high-priestly, 29 ff.
  on important occasions, 7
  originality of, 5
  in relation to His life, 7
Prayer of Jesus (*continued*)
  self-assurance of, 5
  in solitude, 6
Preaching in the liturgy, 251 ff.
Prediction of ruin of Temple, 59
Priesthood
  in Apocalypse, 389
  foundation of, 384 note 19
  general, 383
  mediation of, 182 f.
  and sacrifice, 183, 387 note 38
Primitive liturgy; *see* Liturgy
Priscilla and Apollo, 356; precedence of, 356 f.
Prodigal son, 82
Profanation of Christ's blood, 191
Propagation, modes of, 115
Prophecy
  Christian interpretation of, 169
  among Christians, 266
  esteem for, 268 ff.
  guided by order, 273
  in later Judaism, 265 ff.
  meanings of, 267
  rules governing, 270
  and the Spirit, 267
  subordinated, 272
  and teaching office, 271 f.
  value of, 263 f.
"Prophet," use of the term, 100
Prophets: on external worship, 97 ff.; in synagogue, 50; true and false, 271; with whom associated, 264
Prose hymn, origin of, 235
Psalms
  and gifts, 281
  in Jesus' life of prayer, 17 ff.
  love of Temple in, 46
  how old in the Church, 288
  origin of, 282
  pre-eminence of, 282
  qualities of, 282
  singing of, 281 ff.
  synonyms of, 284
  use of hymns and, 281
Pseudoepigraphic books in the Law, 51 f.

Publican, posture in prayer, 28
Purification, kinds of, 188 f.

Ransom and redemption, 170
Reader in Apocalypse, 247 f.
Reading: importance of, 243 f.; how performed, 242 f.
Reconciliation and prayer, 60
Refrain in Jesus' prayers, 14
Regulation of liturgical worship, 379 ff.
Religion, supremacy of, 355
Resignation: and acquiescence, 87: on the cross, 17 ff.; in high-priestly prayer, 32 f.; kinds of, 87
Resurrection, Paul and adversaries of, 165 f.
Revelations, restrictions of, 379 f.
Revision, literary, 401 f.
Rite, sacrificial, 174
Ritual of Old Testament, 187
Rome, house of assembly in, 337

Sabbath
  and charity, 74 f.
  Codex D on the, 74
  and the creation, 75
  eternal, 179 f.
  how long observed, 392 f.
  Paul and extremists, 342 f.
  and reading, 241
  in teaching of Jesus, 73 ff.
Sacraments, old and new, 152
Sacred banquet: the breaking of bread, 290 ff.; the Lord's Supper, 300 ff.; the table of the Lord, 309 ff.
Sacred meal: in Jewish liturgy, 311 ff.; meaning of, 312 f.; among pagans, 312 f.; and unity, 395 f.
Sacred song, expressions for, 284
Sacrifice
  of Christ, 183
  in heaven, 184
  in Hebrews, 178, 192
  and justice, 98 note
Sacrifice (*continued*)
  kinds of, 190
  pagan and Christian, 327
  and worship, 148 f.
Sadducees and the Jewish liturgy, 54
Salvation: meaning of, 164 f.; source of, 163 f.
Samaritan woman and Jesus, 58, 93 ff., 119
Scientific investigation, limits of, 4
Scribe, commendation of, 61
Scribes and Jesus, 64 ff.
Scripture
  consolation of, 244
  fulfillment of, 66 f.
  interpretations of, 333 f.
  reading of, 241 ff.
  and scandal of the cross, 171
  transcendence of, 116
Sedra, meaning of, 241 f.
Seneca, religion of, 128
Serapis, table of, 312
Sermon on the Mount, teaching about prayer, 8
Shema: nature of, 83; times when said, 341
Shemone Esre: spirit of, 88; times when said, 341
"Shepherd," to whom applied, 81
Silas at Philippi, 285 f.
Simeon, love of liturgy, 114
Simon Magus and Peter, 277 f.
Singing of psalms and hymns, 281 ff.
Slaves and masters, 352
Social union, source of, 38
Song, kinds of, 285 ff.
Speech in church, women and, 361 ff.
Spirit
  effects of, 158 f.
  fulness of, 265 ff.
  and gift of rapture, 266 f.
  when given, 266
  to whom given, 158 f.
"Spiritual," 326
"Spiritual canticle," 285
"Spiritual food," 325 f.

Spiritual sacrifice, origin of term, 148
Stephanas in Corinth, 337, 386
Stephen: accusation of, 62; prayer of, 16, 223
Stoics, place among Greeks, 129
Summaries
  breaking of bread, 298 f.
  Christ's death and glory, 161 f.
  contents of prayer, 239 f.
  early controversies, 393
  elements of common prayer, 39
  fellowship with divinity, 325 f.
  growth of Scripture, 249 f.
  influence of Christian faith, 140 f.
  inheritance from Judaism, 113
  Jesus and Jewish piety, 77 f.
  Jesus' practice of prayer, 33
  Jewish influences, 113 f.
  liturgy and the Law, 54
  Lord's Supper, 308
  meal in common, 298 f.
  pagan influences, 130 f.
  Paul on Lord's Supper, 305
  Paul on prophecy, 270 f.
  Paul's influence on liturgy, 403
  prayer in name of Jesus, 217 f.
  the prayers of Jesus, 90
  table and cup, 316
  woman's religious equality, 367 f.
  worship of Jesus, 173 f.
Sunday: meaning of, 345; names for, 344 f.; observance of, 346 ff.
Symbolic acts, origin of, 154
Synagogue
  Christians in, 57 f., 108, 330 ff.
  elements of worship in, 49 f., 241
  frequentation of, 63 ff., 333 f.
  Jewish piety in the, 48 ff.
  and mount Garizim, 94 f.
  oral exposition in, 50
  origin of, 49
  reading in, 50
  and sacrifice, 49
  and Temple, 48, 332 f.
  value of, 101 f.
  women in, 357, 367
Synagogues, 107
Synoptics: and John, 21; and verbal accuracy, 22
Syntyche, praise of, 357

Tabernacle, kinds of, 179 f.
Tabitha, resurrection of, 230
Table: fellowship in the, 310; liturgical connections of, 311 f.
Table of the Lord: and the sacred banquet, 309 ff.; in the Septuagint, 311
Table prayers: of Jesus, 35; spirit of, 35 f.
Tallith, by whom worn, 92
Teachers: classes of, 258 f.; qualities of, 259 f.; restrictions of, 259 f.
Teaching of Jesus on prayer, 34 ff.
Temple
  admiration of, 47
  delegations to, 48
  Paul in the, 330
  priests and laity in, 45
  profanation of, 47
  in the psalms, 46
  reconstruction of, 48
  relation of Jesus to: His attitude to its sacrifices, 60; His love for, 56 ff.; place of teaching, 57; His prediction regarding, 59; His superiority to, 58
  relation of Jews to, 45
  sublimity of, 91
  symbolism of, 383
  and synagogue, 48
  time of services, 330, 341
  veneration for, 59
  voice from heaven in, 23 f.
Temptation of Jesus, 177
Tephillin, by whom worn, 92
Terminology of Paul, 216
Texts to prove priesthood, 387
"Thanks be to God," origin of, 401
Thanksgiving
  and beneficence, 236 f.
  frequency of, 234 f.
  importance of, 236
  kinds of, 355
  in New Testament song, 285 f.

Theios choros, meaning of, 47 f.
Theophrastus on synagogal worship, 118
Thessalonica, synagogue at, 107
Times of prayer: antiquity of, 340; during week, 341 f.
Times when liturgy was celebrated, 340 ff.
Timothy, education of, 246
Tithes in Old Testament, 178
Tone of voice in liturgical assemblies, 376 ff.
Tongues, gift of, 273 ff.: dangers attending, 277 ff.; definition of, 275 f.; details in, 274 f.; how expressed, 274 ff.; and interpretation, 276 f.
Tradition: amplitude of, 62; origin of term, 144; in singing psalms, 36
Translation, influence of, 21
Troas, breaking of bread in, 297
Tyre, Paul's prayer at, 201

Unbelievers, in Christian assemblies, 350 f.
Union
  in Acts, 196 f.
  and devotion, 46
  elements of, 196
  with God and brethren, 38
  in high-priestly prayer, 31
  how expressed, 38 f.
  kinds of, 195 ff.
  and kingdom of God, 38
  and liturgical development, 198 f.
Universalism and Judaism, 116
Upbuilding
  in development, 397 f.
  how effected, 37
  and gifts, 279
  power of, 370 f.
Upbuilding (*continued*)
  in prophets and teachers, 384
  in St. Paul, 369 ff.
  source of, 370 f.
  universality of, 370 f., 379
Ὑποτύπωσις, definition of, 272
Upper room: purpose of, 197; synonym of, 335; in various places, 334 f.
Urbs candida, title of city, 376
Utterances, kinds of, 278

"Veil," in I Cor. 11: 10, 360
Verbal variations, unimportance of, 44
Voice from heaven, in Temple, 23 f.

Washing of feet, meaning of, 373 f.
Water, spirituality of, 152
"We," in prayers of Jesus, 34 f.
Widow, generosity of, 60
Wine, symbolism of, 315
Women
  court of, 366 f.
  equality of, 352
  gift of discernment, 363 f.
  gift of prophecy, 356 ff., 365 f.
  influence of Jewish custom, 366
  ritualistic uncleanness, 367
  sacrificial acts, 367
  speech in church, 361 ff.
  subordination of, 358 ff.
  in synagogues, 357, 367
  veil of, 358 ff.
Worship
  of Jesus, 163 ff.
  kinds of, 374
  and life, 156 ff.
  in private houses, 109 f.
  in the synagogue, 97

Zachary in the Temple, 111